LIBRARY
SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

The
CHRISTIAN STATESMAN
Founded in 1867
Jesus Christ Is Civil Governor among the Nations

If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper, but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us and bring our glory into profound obscurity.

—*Daniel Webster*

Vol. LVIII. AUGUST, 1924 No. 8

The National Reform Association

Organized in 1863

HEADQUARTERS:

Publication Bldg., 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

This Association was founded by men and women who had conducted a great missionary movement to the nation in the years preceding the Civil War. It derived its name from the words of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation of March 30, 1863. He said:—

> *"It is the duty of nations, as well as of men, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth announced in the Holy Scriptures, and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord; and insomuch as we know that, by His Divine Law, nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of civil war which now desolates the land, may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our NATIONAL REFORMATION as a whole people?"*

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

(Founded in 1867)

Official Organ of

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

Published monthly at the offices of the Association at

PITTSBURGH, PA.—Annual subscription $2.00

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

VOL. LVIII AUGUST, 1924 NO. 8

CONTENTS

Page

Notes by the Way 3
The American Lutheran Survey and the Christian Amendment 4
Jabez Says 10
And Martha Says 12

OUTLOOK

The Air Power of the Nations 14
A Piece of Belated Justice 15
Mussolini Still Invincible 15
The Hughes Note to Japan 16
No Substitute for the Book 16
Henry Ford on the Bible 17
The Attorney General and the Gasoline Trust 18
A Good and True Fairy Tale 18
Industrial Goodwill in Operation 19
Gumption on the Bench 19
An American Eagle 20
Ramsay Macdonald on the Christian Sabbath 20
The Good Citizen's Responsibility 21
Return of a Prodigal Church 22
A Moderator and the Son of a Moderator 22

Special Correspondence from Mormondom 23
Sympathy and Admiration for President and Mrs. Coolidge 24
The Vatican and the World War 25
Protestant Unification Defined 26
Loyal Protestants 27
For Protestant Unity 27
The Centrifugal Democratic Convention 30
Dr. Scott Accepts New Post 31
R. P. Synod Reaffirms Its Support of the N. R. A. 31
A Big Second Fiddle 32
Coolidge and Dawes Credit to Their Party 33

EDITORIAL

A Super-horror in Politics 34
Human Ants 34
Bryan's Strength 34
A Squall over the Great Lakes 35
Triple Alliance of Common Sense 35
Why Youth Goes Insane 36
A Candid Candidate 37
The Whisky Business and Its Wicked Kin 37
Lyman E. Davis, Editor 37
The Strength and Weakness of Our Sabbath Laws 38
The Bar Association on the Alien 41
The Corruption Funds 41
Henry Collin Minton, Christian Leader 42

The Passing of Bryan 43
We Recommend "Light on Mormonism" 44
Mrs. Shepard and the Mormon Menace 44
Thuggee Congress Strangling President 45
Testimonial to Women's Board 46
Reformed Presbyterian Synod 47
About President Edgar 48
Looking toward the Kingdom 48
An Attitude for Christians 49

Address contributed articles to the Editorial Department; and business communications to the Business Department; The Christian Statesman, Publication Bldg., 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Entered as Second Class matter, July 30, 1906, at Pittsburgh, Pa., under Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The National Reform Association

Organized 1863

Chartered under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania

DIRECTORS

John C. Acheson	R. M. Downie	David McNaugher
W. J. Aiken	Thomas D. Edgar	J. M. McQuilkin
J. V. Benson	Robert J. Gibson	R. W. Redpath
Frank J. Cannon	Charles N. Hanna	John Rodda
James A. Cosby	Wm. Albert Harbison	Thomas R. Thoburn
C. L. Daugherty	Daniel L. Marsh	James S. Tibby
Frank H. Davis	James S. Martin	J. W. Vickerman
Lyman E. Davis	E. C. McCabe	W. I. Wishart
Robert J. Dodds	James S. McGaw	Richard Cameron Wylie

OFFICERS

President.....Thomas D. Edgar
Vice-President.....J. W. Vickerman
General Secretary.....James S. McGaw
Recording Secretary.....R. W. Redpath
Treasurer.....James S. Tibby
Assistant Treasurer.....Henry Peel

REGIONAL OFFICES AND MANAGERS

Boston, Mass., 408 Pierce Bldg., J. M. Tibbetts.

Chicago, Ill., 19 S. LaSalle St., Wm. S. Fleming.

COMMITTEE ON MANAGEMENT

W. I. Wishart, Thomas D. Edgar, J. S. McGaw, Thos. R. Thoburn, James S. Martin, James M. McQuilkin, Robert J. Gibson.

DEPARTMENT OF FIELD WORK

Acting Chairman.....Sarah Ernest Snyder

COMMITTEE ON RELATION WITH THE CHURCHES

Chairman.....James M. McQuilkin

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Founded 1867

Official organ of The National Reform Association
Published at 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh, Pa. $2.00 the year.

Editor-in-chief.....Richard Cameron Wylie
Associate Editor.....Dorothy C. Hyde
Business Manager.....Arthur B. Cooper

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATION

Thomas D. Edgar, Richard Cameron Wylie, Lyman E. Davis, James S. Martin, Arthur B. Cooper, W. J. Aiken, J. V. Benson, J. W. Vickerman; Vice Chairman, J. M. McQuilkin; Chairman, Frank J. Cannon.

Notes by the Way

Tammany has picked its new boss, and is prepared once more to pick the plums.

Clint Howard says that some reform organizations pray: "Give us this day our daily compromise."

Rough-necks and gunmen in the galleries made the noise for Al Smith, but another man got the votes.

The citizen may "pay his money and take his choice." But also he pays his money when the other fellow takes the choice.

With Northern Methodism and Southern Methodism uniting for our Lord, the nation moves one step nearer to Kingdom conditions.

It is astonishing how wicked a society for political purposes becomes, when it takes the designation of three K's instead of merely being the K of C.

The difference between the Daugherty method and the Stone method of dealing with illegal combines, is the difference between a swamp and a river. One is motionless, breeding noxious things of death; and one is moving, and emitting life-giving radiance.

If competitive robbery keeps on, the stories of the big hauls will have to be printed on the sport pages of the newspapers. The latest exploit to date, realized $3,000,000 from the robbery of a United States mail car. This sets a mark which it will be hard to beat. The bandits in this case ought to go into an international match, America against the world.

Bootlegging and passing counterfeit money are equally respectable occupations. Would you allow a known counterfeiter to belong to your club? No. Then be just as determined toward a bootlegger—he is a brazen brute, with no right to mingle in human society.

The Rhode Island state senate was dispersed by the introduction of poison gas into the chamber. That same thing might have been tried a hundred times on the United States Senate, and nobody would have found it out. Mere chlorine fumes would not be noticed there. When it comes to gas, the Senate "rolls its own."

STORY OF THE MONTH

Congratulations! Some protection may be afforded to human life, after awhile, against murder by motor.

Within four weeks past, half a score of magistrates have treated motor murder cases just as they would treat gun murder cases.

One judge says that a drunken motorist is a homicidal maniac.

Another judge says that he would as lief turn a drug fiend gunman loose in children's play grounds, as permit a whisky sodden driver to range the crowded streets of a city.

And still another judge says that if his own wife were killed with an ax by a creature crazed on whisky, he would demand the vengeance of the law; and that he will equally impose the vengeance of the law upon any booze lunatic who assassinates with a motor car.

Congratulations! Maybe we can reduce the motor slaughter from 12,000 a year to 10,000.

The American Lutheran Survey and the Christian Amendment

By Richard Cameron Wylie

The *American Lutheran Survey,* in its July issue, publishes in full an article which appeared in the June issue of The Christian Statesman, which was a reply to an article appearing in the May issue of the *Survey,* dealing with the principles, aims and methods of The National Reform Association. The *Survey* follows the reprint of our article, with a discussion so pointed, incisive, and so thoroughly characterized with the Christian spirit, that we reproduce it here in its entirety.

We regard the questions here under discussion as questions of fundamental importance, and so worthy of all the space the discussion requires. In the first place, we think the writer in the Statesman used a term which is a little too strong, when he judged our intention as an intention to "antagonize;" and we are sure that he gave it too wide an application, when he made it include "principles, aims and methods." In general, we are in sympathy with what we understand the "aims" of the Association to be,—to bring about a nation-wide acknowledgment of the spiritual lordship of Jesus Christ, and the practice of the Christian Religion in all relationships of life.

The idea that this may be done by proclamation, as it were, through the enactment of an amendment to the national Constitution, formally asserting such recognition, or through any other legislation, is an idea which we do not accept,—maybe because we cannot grasp it! It is possible that we do become "confused" in our thinking at this point, to which we have given special attention for years; for just what conception of the "Nation" our friends who advocate the theory of the Association, have, has never been quite clear to us. They seem to conceive of the Nation, as having a personality as definite and distinct and as responsible as that of any individual man. That may be true, but we have never been able to see it, and if it is true, then there is where our whole line of thinking must begin to differ.

To us, there is but one unit of personality and moral responsibility,—the individual man. The terms "national spirit," "national responsibility," and such like terms, are but convenient and popular terms for the designation of the concurrence of the spirit and views of those individuals whose spirit and views exert the widest influence at a given time. That is as near to an ascription of personality to a nation, as we can go in our limited ability to think.

We admit that we may have used a stronger term than facts warrant, when we expressed the fear (no positive assertion) that the Association was inclined to practices of professional lobbyists, in its efforts to attain its purposes through legislation. We accept the explanation of the spokesman of the Association in the Statesman, and withdraw any unjust criticism that may have been in our reference to that point.

On the other hand, we reassert our general position on the point of reform through legislation: That law can never effect a real reform; that no legislation should be sought beyond developed public opinion; that legislation should be the expression, rather than the creator of public opinion; that all new legislation must be consistent with existing legislation; that no methods of securing legislation inconsistent with above principles are legitimate.

We will let the "thrust" at the "Christian Amendment" stand. We would rejoice beyond measure if the nation were so thoroughly Christianized that the principles of the Christian Religion determined every act of legislation, and were expressed in every national ideal; but, until that is the case, such legislation would be more or less inconsistent and ineffective; and, were that the case, no such legislation would be needed.

We do not believe this to be a proper subject of legislation. Besides, this proposed amendment touches the organic law of our country at a very vital point. Would it be consistent with the Constitution as it now stands? Would it not annul that part which guarantees religious liberty? Could a Jew, for instance, qualify for

office under a constitution which required the recognition of Christ as Lord, if the requirement were more than a mere letter? If he could not qualify for office, could he be allowed to vote? If not allowed to vote, would it not be on account of religion? Where, then, would be the guarantee of religious liberty? If refused for the Jew, who else could claim it, except by the forfeiture of citizenship?

The writer in the STATESMAN did not clear up the very important point for us, on how and when and by what means Christ would function as our recognized national King, any more really or any more definitely than He does now. We are confused in our thinking at this point. We sincerely ask for light. Our effort to state our intellectual difficulty is pronounced "a rather complicated line of reasoning." Our answer is: Forget it, and tell us plainly what the Lord would do differently, and how, if the "Christian Amendment" were adopted now. We cannot forget how persistently He repudiated every suggestion of identity with a political kingdom, made by His disciples while He was with them in the flesh; and how emphatic He was, in His statement that His Kingdom is not of this world, and that the Kingdom of God is within men. We say that His kingdom in the world, the kingdom in which He is truly acknowledged and served, may be thought of properly as identical with the invisible Church, only because it includes all of those within whom His kingdom is found. We might go further, but we might do no more than show "confused thinking" or get off on a "complicated line of reasoning," and we do not wish to do either. A simple line of reasoning is that, if we cannot get a clear idea of the meaning and purpose of the "Christian Amendment," there are likely to be a sufficient number of others, whose support this "Amendment" ought to have if it is right and important, in the same fix, to warrant the advocates of the "Amendment" in a still further patient effort to elucidate it. We intend no sarcasm in this statement of the case. We would like to see a full simple statement of the practical meaning and value of the proposed "Amendment," and we desire this from the standpoint of one who sincerely prays and works for the day when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father; and when there shall be, among those who thus confess, the greatest number possible who shall make that confession in the joy of their salvation.

The one question involved in this friendly controversy with the *Survey*, relates to the real meaning of the Christian Amendment. To this question we will try to give a definite answer, looking for illumination and guidance to that same Spirit who has thus far presided over this discussion.

In any attempt to define the meaning of the Christian Amendment, the first thing to be said is: *It means that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations.* It does not mean that He will consent to become Ruler, when the nation acknowledges Him as such. A national acknowledgment of Him will not make Him Ruler. He is Ruler now, and has been Ruler ever since God the Father exalted Him, and gave Him the name that is above every name.

The proof of this proposition is found primarily in the Bible, and it is clear, definite and ample. He, Himself, declared that all authority in heaven and on earth was given Him. And He followed that statement, with the great commission authorizing His disciples to go into all nations and preach the gospel of the Kingdom. Evidently He claimed the right thus to commission them, because His authority extends over the nations.

He is not Ruler in any merely nominal, figurative, or honorary sense. He is the real Ruler of the nations. Three things stand out most prominently in the teaching of His apostles, namely: Christ's death on the cross for our sins; His bodily resurrection; His enthronement as the Ruler of all things, which certainly includes rulership over the nations. But the testimony of Scripture does not stop with mere general statements as to the universality of His dominion. "He is King of kings and Lord of lords." "He is the Governor among the nations." "All nations shall serve Him." "The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."

Again, the Christian Amendment means that the principles involved are fundamental political principles. It seems difficult to persuade some people that there is any such thing as national or institutional religion. They insist that religion is wholly a personal matter between the individual and God, and that civil government is traveling outside its proper sphere, when it performs any religious function whatever. We do not bring this charge, however, against the writer in the *Lutheran Survey*. But it seems to us that nearly all those good people who are not ready to support the Christian Amendment, fail to grasp the fact that there are certain fundamental religious truths, which are essentially political and, without which, civil government cannot exist. Anarchy is essentially atheistic. If there were no God, there could be no civil government. There must be a Supreme Ruler, if there are to be civil rulers properly clothed with authority. If Jesus Christ had not died to save the world, the world would not have been saved but would have fallen into chaos. If Jesus Christ were not enthroned as the Mediatorial Ruler, and if God in His absolute character were to deal with the nations of men, no mercy could be shown them, and nothing but stern justice would be their portion.

The principle that Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations is a political principle. It is fundamental to the very existence of nations. Nations are not required by any definite law to adopt written constitutions; but, when they do, they should embody in such documents all the essential, fundamental, political principles. We know of no reason why an exception should be made of the one now under consideration. Many others might be ignored, with less risk to national welfare.

Proceeding with our definition, the next thing meant by the Christian Amendment is, that *the Rulership of Jesus Christ is a fact of which nations should take account*. It is commonly held by Christians that the Kingdom of Jesus Christ is a spiritual Kingdom, and the writer in the *Survey* uses the expression, "the spiritual lordship of Jesus Christ." We, also, believe that His Kingdom is spiritual; but, at the same time, we take note of the fact that no such language is used anywhere in the Bible. It seems to us that many Christians allow themselves to be misled and confused, by this and similar expressions. They seem to think that there is no such reality about Christ's reign, as calls for recognition on the part of nations and governments.

But the Scriptures are quite clear, in their declarations as to the practical nature of this reign. It is spiritual in its purpose, in its methods, and in its means and forces. But it deals with the nations of men, as entities and integral parts of His Kingdom; and He does not confine Himself to spiritual forces, in dealing with them. All the forces of heaven and earth are at His command, and He uses just the kind and just the measure of these forces which, in His wisdom, He sees fit to use. He sometimes uses one nation to chastise another. If His rulership were spiritual, in the sense in which some people use this term, nations might be excused from giving it any attention, since, in that case, there would be nothing definite, nothing tangible, nothing that could touch the life of the nation in any practical way. But Jesus Christ is not a mere titular ruler, like some of the figureheads that sometimes are elevated to places of honor. He is a real King; and, because this is so, and because He is functioning constantly as King, dealing with nations according to their character and conduct, nations and governments should adjust themselves to these facts.

Once more, the Christian Amendment means that each nation has a *defi-*

nite, distinct, pronounced moral character. On this point there is much confusion of thought. Ever since international law became a science, the term "moral personality" has been commonly applied to nations. There are people who cannot conceive of any kind of a person except an individual human being. If they would study, for only half an hour, the history of the word "person," they would probably obtain new light on this matter. The term has long been used in discussions of international law, because national character and conduct are here the primary considerations. And it is impossible to have any kind of a code of international law, without making use of the principle that nations have character. They have rights, they owe duties to one another, they are the creatures of law; and they have all the essential elements of personality. Although this term is never applied to them in the Bible, they are uniformly treated as having moral character, which involves all that is essential to personality.

But it is not essential to our argument that we insist on the acceptance of this term. Let us, therefore, forget all about the expression "moral personality of the nation," for a few moments. Is it not a fact that everybody—at least when not engaged in controversy—not only admits, but strenuously insists on, all that the expression implies? Do not we all believe, that every nation has a character of its own? We praise or blame nations for what they are and for what they do. It is true that national leaders, who are individual men, have much to do with the moulding of national character. But we do not hold to national character, apart from the people composing the nation. Yet national character is not identical with the character of any set of men, however influential. England, France, Germany, Italy, America, each has its own national characteristics, and they are either righteous or unrighteous.

As a corollary to the proposition just considered, it should be stated that the Christian Amendment means that *Jesus Christ, as Ruler of nations, takes note of national character and conduct.* And His governmental functions are doubtless adapted to national conditions. In urging the Amendment, we are not aiming primarily to create a piece of governmental machinery, through which Jesus Christ may function as civil Ruler. The primary aim is to adjust our political machinery so that it will function in harmony with the government of Jesus Christ. We do not endorse the idea that a nation can be made Christian by a mere constitutional acknowledgment of Jesus Christ, or by a mere proclamation that it is Christian. We trust that no critic will charge us with any such folly. We think we know enough about the real essence of religion to know that it does not consist in a mere formal profession. But we know, also, that God requires the outward profession as a sign of the inward grace.

Moreover, we know the process of securing constitutional amendments, and we know that the Christian Amendment can not possibly be secured until the people are ready for it. We agree with the writer in the *Lutheran Survey* that, until that time comes, such an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ "would be more or less inconsistent and ineffective." But we do not agree with him that it would not be needed, after the people are ready for it. Might not the same thing be said about a personal profession of religion? Before one is truly converted, such a profession would be insincere; and, after conversion, it would not be necessary. Apply the same philosophy to other departments of political life. Public officials ought to be loyal to the government, but, if they are not, to secure a pledge of loyalty would be

more or less inconsistent and ineffective; and, if they are such, a pledge would not be needed. Each state in the Union ought to be in loyal subjection to the general government, and, if it is not, a constitutional confession of loyalty would be more or less ineffective and inconsistent; and, if it is, it would not be needed. People do not argue on this wise with respect to anything except the Christian Amendment.

But having a sincere desire to deal with absolute fairness, and fearing that we may not quite understand the position of the *Survey* on the point just considered, we pass on to the statement which immediately follows, which is:

> We do not believe this to be a proper subject of legislation. Besides, this proposed amendment touches the organic law of our country at a very vital point. Would it be consistent with the Constitution as it now stands? Would it not annul that part which guarantees religious liberty? Could a Jew, for instance, qualify for office under a constitution which required the recognition of Christ as Lord, if the requirement were more than a mere letter? If he could not qualify for office, could he be allowed to vote? If not allowed to vote, would it not be on account of religion? Where then would be the guarantee of religious liberty? If refused for the Jew, who else could claim it, except by the forfeiture of citizenship?

We have never known the case of the critic to be urged more strongly or pointedly, than is done in this series of interrogations. And the interrogative form of the objection is designed to carry the implication that only one answer can be given to each inquiry. Doubtless there are some who will at once conclude that the cause of the Christian Amendment is lost forever, and lost just because the Jew cannot qualify as a full-fledged citizen under a Christian government. We are glad that the writer in the *Survey* brings the Jew to the front, as the most formidable obstacle in the way of the Christian Amendment.

There are several things to be said about the Jew in this connection. We have not altogether despaired of his conversion. We once heard the late Rabbi Levy of Pittsburgh, make the statement, in a public address, that there ought to be more of the Spirit of Jesus Christ in our national life. Unbiased Jews have often admitted that they have more liberty in the United States than anywhere else, and some of them have even given the credit to the Christian character of our nation. In the process of the propaganda necessary to secure the Christian Amendment, it is at least possible, that the Jews as a body may be converted to Christianity. The Scriptures contain the assurance that this will sometime occur.

But the problem with which we are asked to wrestle, is this: Would the Christian Amendment wrong the Jew while he is a Jew? The inquiries quoted above, proceed on the assumption that the Jew, as a Jew, has certain primordial rights, of which he would be robbed by the Christian Amendment. Suppose we now exercise our prerogative in asking a few questions. Has the Jew the right to veto any of the existing Christian features of our Government? In forty-six states we have laws setting apart the first day of the week as the day of weekly rest, under the title "Lord's Day," "Sabbath," as well as "Sunday." How can the Jew take an oath to enforce such laws? And, if he cannot enforce them, how can he vote for others to enforce them? The almost universal custom is for the machinery of our Government to rest on the first day of the week, but to be in operation on the seventh. How can the Jew adjust himself to this situation and remain a Jew? Should we adjust our customs to accommodate Jews? Do the rights of Jews justify a movement so to do?

But these inquiries are only preliminary. This is a Christian nation, ac-

cording to a statement made by the Supreme Court of the United States. Has the Jew the right to de-Christianize it? If he has that right, what would be involved in the process of de-Christianization? Would it involve the elimination of all the Christian features of our laws, customs, and usages? And when the Jew has finished his work of remodeling our Government, what will have become of the rights of Christians? Even if the Jew could not take the oath to support a Christian constitution, would he, for that reason, be deprived of any real right? So long as he is not required to renounce his Jewish faith, but is protected in the exercise of it, can he complain that he is wronged? The Jews, as a people, once rejected Jesus Christ as King; and they are still cursed as a result of their sin and folly. Is it wise for Christian America to join with the Jews in this rejection, and thus to come under the same curse? The question here involved is one of adjustment. Should the nation in its government adjust itself to the fact that Jesus Christ is King, or should it adjust itself to the unbelief of the Jew? Should not the Jew adjust himself to the principles of civil government, as they are embodied in the constitution and laws of the land in which he resides? And should not these constitutions and laws be squared with the political principles of the Christian Scriptures?

One more point needs attention. The writer in the *Survey* wants to know "what the Lord would do differently, and how, if the Christian Amendment were adopted now." This is an old question, and after an explanatory statement we will give a Biblical answer. It seems to us quite clear that our nation is not in right relation with God. The prevalence of crime, even in the official sphere, is sufficient proof. Divine judgments are pending. Our Biblical answer is furnished by Jeremiah who speaks for the Lord in these words:

At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from its evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto it. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit it. (Jer. 18:7-10)

If we understand the plan of God with respect to nations, He purposes using them to promote His cause on the earth. To this end He has entrusted the government of them to Jesus Christ as King. If they fail to do His will, they will be punished; and eventually destroyed. And history is a commentary on this truth. If they are obedient, He uses them to promote the interests of His cause. The constitutional acknowledgment of Christ as King, would be a public declaration of national purpose to carry on government on the righteous principles of His law. It would serve as the key to the Christian character and purpose of the Government. It would place all Christian laws, customs and usages on a constitutional basis. It would be a becoming act of reverence to the reigning King.

The writer in the *Lutheran Survey* fails to see the difference between the aim of The National Reform Association, and the effort to make Christ king of Judea, in the days of His flesh. This seems very strange to us. The former is as far above the latter as the heavens are above the earth. The latter was a proposition to set Him over a little province consisting of a few square miles, while the former is a proposition to acknowledge Him, as already enthroned by the Father as King of kings and Lord of lords.

Jabez Says

When some future historian, commenting upon the glories and defects of this age, shall write his chapters on politics, he must dip his pen in satire, to describe the stark, staring madness with which Americans enjoy themselves at national conventions.

The selection of a President of the United States is one of the most solemn rites of our citizenship. The making of the party platform is at once the confession of a faith and the promise of a performance.

In all reverence before God and in all duty to the world in which we live, we ought to enter upon these things with thanksgiving for our past and with a prayer for our future.

But instead of entering into such solemnity, we go like a lot of Bedlamites—in howling frenzy—to express our sovereign will.

A few there are who keep a serious purpose, and who are able usually, to perpetrate it upon the scatter-brained horde. And a few others there are, who keep cool enough to see which is the band wagon, and who are alert enough to board it in time for the victorious parade. And a few there are, who go with pockets full of tickets to distribute to friends in the expectation of reciprocal return.

But the whole mass at the convention is as crazy as any delirious savage tribe that ever danced around its medicine man.

Ordinarily, there is mighty little difference between the two conventions. This year, the advantage of sobriety was on the side of the Republican party. It had more to be sober about. It had to walk across that dizzy, single strand leading from oil scandal to Coolidge. It had to show some degree of rationality. But even there the rabies broke loose a little. Everyone knew that Calvin Coolidge would be nominated—as he deserved to be; and yet the delegates worked themselves up into twenty minutes of yelling and cheering, just as voodoo doctors work themselves and their companion savages into a crazy delirium.

And at the Democratic Convention, the exhibitions were worse than an orgy of insane Bolshevists drunk on vodka.

Thank God, He who watches over the best interests of this country can guide the voters better than they can be guided by conventions, in which the object of the leaders is to render the delegates insane, before they are called upon to decide.

Our United States Treasury has just found a trifling item of prospective surplus amounting to $400,000,000. Lucky that Congress had adjourned before the news leaked out.

Scientists have demonstrated that many isles of the sea and many vast regions of the earth are made beautiful with foliage, and fruitful with edible plants, by the birds which carry seeds on their long flights and drop them into responsive soil.

And now there comes from Bulgaria and from India, a demonstration that birds can carry seeds of purpose, and messages of sorrow or encouragement, from continent to continent.

A schoolmaster, at Sofia, captured a swallow in the late Fall, and fastened to its leg a wafer of message reading:

"Greetings from unhappy and greatly wronged Bulgaria."

This last Spring the same swallow returned to him with another message reading:

"Better days are coming for both you and us, suffering and wronged people—Melani, India."

Verily the achievements of man, and even the unconscious activities of the lower creation, are all conspiring to make of the human race one mighty and sympathetic brotherhood.

The insanity which culminates in murder usually has a slow and easy beginning.

Parents ought to realize this.

In studying the cases of the young truants, bandits and murderers of today, who constitute more than fifty per cent of the offenders brought to the prisons, one is fully assured that the beginning was not in bank robbery nor brigandage, nor the taking of human life; but was in a small waywardness at home or at school or during the hours apart from these institutions. The boy or girl finds the Sabbath or the day school tedious and is prompted to play hookey; and then one after another of the proper restraints and the inspiring incentives are cast aside. And youth comes to direct its own movements, to determine its own outgoings and incomings, to select its own associates, to overrule parental judgment concerning pleasures. Before parents are fully aware of it, many of the children have grown away beyond any parental discipline.

Sometimes older people seem to take delight in and to encourage this waywardness, as proving that the children are smart; that they are sophisticated beyond their fellows of the same age; that they have learned a thousand things that the parents did not know at the same time of life. And sometimes the elders are so indulgent that they cannot say no in response to any request—until it is too late to say anything except to a judge and a jury.

Youth is allowed to indulge itself in self-will until it takes the fatal step, and then partial friends and paid alienists discover that the final horror was due to insanity.

That Chicago medical man told what kind of insanity this thing is. It is the insanity of the smart aleck; and the proper and early preventive was a session in the woodshed with a resolute dad and a trunk strap. And while we are speaking about the trunk strap, the boy is not so much to blame for its hanging dusty behind the woodshed door. He is quite as willing to receive as his dad is to give.

Political campaigns usually bring forward the most injurious construction and venomous misconstruction of a candidate's words and acts.

But that of Brigadier General Dawes presents an exception.

Before the committee which was investigating war expenditures, Charlie Dawes was supposed to have uttered some profanity. Indeed, so certain were the senators on the committee that his language was profane, that they ordered many expurgations; and the official stenographers signed a certificate to the effect that they had made the elisions by order.

The favorite expletive—which got on the wires and into all the press—was one with which General Dawes greeted every captious and insolent question. In answer to the implications against the conduct of the expeditionary forces and the purchasing bureau, he shouted again and again at the committee:

"Hell an' Maria! We won the war didn't we?"

Nearly everyone in the country thought Charlie Dawes was saying Hell and Maria. It now appears from a statement made by a political press bureau which seems to be operating in his behalf, that he was speaking of his two favorite sisters, Helen, Maria.

So it seems that Dawes did not "cuss;" he merely cooed.

And Martha Says

America to Italy: "Have you a little scandal in your Cabinet?"

Will some man voter, out of his longer experience in such matters, please tell me how I can vote for the Democratic platform and the Republican candidates?

Because I prefer the Democratic principles and the Republican principals.

That was a splendid thing, when Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard, took issue with Nicholas Murray Butler, president *demeritus* of Columbia, and unhorsed that doughy (no, not doughty) champion of the Wets. But an even more splendid though less spectacular thing preceded, when Dr. Eliot reversed his own opinion and his own custom of life.

Until a very few years ago, Dr. Eliot held a sincere disbelief in the wisdom of prohibition as a measure for public betterment. Moreover, he was accustomed, himself, to a temperate use of stimulants. During the war he noted the improvement in morale and in physical condition, of our young soldiers under the prohibition regime. He observed other good results of its effect. And, at an age when men do not easily change either their opinions or their customs (Dr. Eliot is now past ninety), he remoulded his convictions and, with a fine sincerity, brought his own manner of life into conformity with them. Open-mindedness is not a common attribute of age. And it takes a brave man to change his mind—for the better—at any age. So Dr. Eliot's conversion to the prohibition cause is a high achievement, both of intellect and temperament.

One more tribute, and that from mere Martha, will not mean much to Dr. Eliot, but, in the matter of hero worship as in other things, it is even "more blessed to give than to receive;" so, if for nothing else than its uplifting effect upon myself, I want to pay my profound respects to Charles W. Eliot, a white plumed knight in whose great personality are fused the finest qualities of age and youth, an inspired wisdom and a sublime courage.

An acute friend of mine, who has no particular reverence for politics or politicians, makes caustic but interesting observation on the political situation. He says: "The Republicans have no morals, the Democrats have no sense, and the Progressives have no chance."

An analyst of the two youthful Chicago murderers and of the conditions that produced them, remarks that they did not come from "criminal homes." But in other parts of the article the facts are brought out, that these boys led "upholstered lives;" that, living at home—with every necessity and even every luxury provided, each one received an allowance of $125 a month for spending money; that they had swift motor cars at their disposal day and night; that their time was never supervised, their individuality being quite awesomely respected; that the parents did not know—or did not care—that they reveled in the most decadent books of former centuries and of the present day.

What is a "criminal home," anyway?

To my mind, it is one that gives opportunity and incitement for the development of criminal instincts. And

such a home may be a mansion in an aristocratic avenue or a hovel in a slum. Of course, I believe in comfortable, healthful, wholesome surroundings for youth. But I know that mere comfort and sanitation do not necessarily make a good home. They are only adjuncts of it, as they may be of a criminal home. And I know that, in the midst of squalor, the struggle for his own existence may develop a strength; and the unhappiness of others may arouse a chivalry, that will turn a mere boy into a man of fiber and character and purpose.

* * * * * *

A case has just come to my attention of another boy who has brought disgrace upon himself and upon his family. He has not committed a murder, but he has wrecked other lives and his own.

After the tragedy was discovered, his father said: "I knew he was keeping late hours but I thought it was none of my business."

Not a father's business that his eighteen year old son should be no one knows where, at one or two or three o'clock in the morning!

My grandmother says that this is an age of obedient parents. And I add that the question of too many fathers and mothers today is, "Am I my children's keeper?"

The Ford factory may have turned out its ten millionth car; but bootlegging is the most staggering business in the United States.

In a current magazine, is a true story called "She Raised Her Son to Be a Fighter." It is all about a mother who planned, even before her son was born, to make a champion prize fighter of him. There is no statement of what would have happened if *he* had been *she*. But the child was of the desired gender; and the mother has made her boy a prize fighter who is on his way to a championship.

And though I am no admirer of prize fighting or prize fighters, I must admit that some fine things have gone into this accomplishment. In addition to serious thought and hard work, there has been an inculcation and practice of clean living, self-denial and courage. It is interesting to know that the physical perfection of this young pugilist was begun four generations ago. In all that time, not a man of his father's family ever has been a smoker or a drinker. The pity is that all this remarkable ancestry and training should not have been devoted to a better end.

But this is the particular point that impresses me.

Mrs. Stribling's ambition for her son was not a worthy one; but her determination, her care and energy are worthy of imitation by mothers of higher ideals and intelligence. Her boy is what she wanted him to be. He is realizing her fondest hopes.

Other mothers could make their boys what they want them to be, if they would only want—and work—hard enough.

I wish that all mothers would raise their boys to be fighters—fighters for the truth and the right. And they might if they had enough wishbone and enough backbone. Fond but foolish, sweet but spineless mothers are raising weaklings—or worse. And, if I *had* to choose one or the other, I don't know but that I would rather have my boy a clean living prize fighter than a potentially criminal corner loafer.

And if anyone of my readers shall construe this into an argument for prize fighting, I am going to pray that the Lord will sharpen his—or her—understanding.

OUTLOOK

THE AIR POWER OF THE NATIONS

Great Britain is trying to overtake France in the air service—but she is still far behind.

The present strength of French aviation is 128 squadrons, of which 105 are in France. The service strength of a French squadron is usually ten planes. It is estimated that the number of planes in service is 1,250; and, of these, about 600 are included in the French independent striking force. The total of officers and men is 35,720. According to reports in the office of the British under-secretary of state for the air, the French budget funds for the present year for aviation in all branches are nearly 700,000,000 francs—and, in addition to this sum, an appropriation from the general provision for army and navy may be allocated to aviation. France has been building a great number of planes during the past few years. Her production during 1922 was 3,000 military planes and 300 planes for civil aviation, a small part of which latter supply may have been for export.

At the present time the strength of the whole air force of Great Britain is 39-2/3 squadrons, counting 12 planes to a squadron. And 11-1/2 additional squadrons are being organized this year, to bring the total to 51-1/6 squadrons, with 600 service planes. There has been an authorization for an increase of 400 for home defense; and when these are armed, the strength of the whole air force will be about 1,000 service planes. The man power strength of the force, with 3,152 officers and 26,488 men, is a total of 29,640. But Britain has authorized such increases as will bring this total to 40,000 within the next eighteen months.

The task of Great Britain is much heavier than that of France. Britain must provide air defense for all the Empire, and at the same time keep at home an air force equal or superior to the striking force of any other one of the nations.

Without any immediate fear of an attack from France, the necessity remains, according to the view of British statesman. It is too late to construct air defense after the attack begins. The planes and the men must be able and trained, and the whole operation so disciplined and co-ordinated that it can become effective within the hour.

* * * * * *

In contrast with the large establishments of France and Britain, the total airplane strength of the United States Army and Navy, in the fiscal year 1924-25, will be as follows:

Navy, 152 planes, plus 90 training planes. (Training planes are not believed to be included in the foregoing figures for the British and French air service.)

Army, 483 planes, inclusive of 272 training planes.

The majority of the army planes are obsolete types.

The number of officers and men in aviation on September 30, 1923 was: Army 917 officers, 8,764 men; Navy, including marine corps, 581 officers, 4,021 men; giving a total of 14,283 officers and men, engaged in aviation in the United States Army and Navy.

The aviation budget for 1924-25 is as follows:

Army aviation $13,834,000. Naval aviation $14,590,000. Total $28,424,000. Of the total appropriation, the amount to be spent for purchase of airplanes and other equipment is $7,910,826; of which $5,264,826 is for the Navy and $2,646,000 for the Army.

A PIECE OF BELATED JUSTICE

You do not have to go to the Arabian Nights nor to medieval times in Europe to find romance.

A little more than sixty years ago, on a Mississippi plantation owned by Jefferson Davis, there were many negro slaves.

In Cleveland, Ohio, on the 12th day of June, 1924, Mrs. Mary C. Booze, of Mound Bayou, Mississippi, was elected Republican National Committeewoman from her state.

Mrs. Booze is a negro and a daughter of one of the slaves of Jefferson Davis.

There is probable utility as well as sentimental value for her race, in the elevation of Mrs. Booze to this place of high distinction.

Negro men have sat upon the national committee; but as a rule they have been easy game for the more experienced politicians of the North. Through all the long years since the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments were adopted in 1866 and 1869, the Republican party has been the particular guardian of their political rights, as it has been the particular beneficiary of their political power throughout the North—and occasionally in a Southern state. But it has never seen sufficient reason to make the same vigorous battle for the negro's political rights in Southern states that it has seen fit to make for a protective tariff, or for other basic doctrines and principles of the party. It has used the evasions of the Constitution by Southern states as a good political cry in the North. But, in the South, it winks at the practice by which the negro has been unfranchised.

With a negro woman on the Republican National Committee, and a woman of such ability and courage as Mrs. Booze is said to possess, the Republican party will be confronted by its own responsibility. The average woman will not trade away the rights of her children for the sake of party regularity or quiescence.

And the country will welcome the advent of Mrs. Booze into a position of authority from which she can tell to her party and the nation, what are the political rights of her race as well as the political wrongs which are perpetrated upon them.

MUSSOLINI STILL INVINCIBLE

Mussolini still rises superior to bitter antagonisms. This Napoleonic leader, coming out of obscurity to more than imperial power in Italy, still has destiny on his side.

It was predicted by the wiseacres, that as he went up like a flaming rocket, he would be suddenly extinguished and fall in darkness. But not yet.

Mussolini has escaped political storm and also an earthquake; and he is still trusted by the Italian senate, which has given him a vote of confidence of more than ten to one.

Mussolini had made oil contracts with the Sinclair corporation, and the scandals which broke loose in the United States started all his enemies after him. The hour was deemed opportune; but he calmed the angry sea with a wave of his Fascist hand.

Then the Socialist deputy, Matteotti, was kidnapped and murdered by friends of the Mussolini regime. A social earthquake. And still Mussolini stands unmoved.

Evidently his time is not yet. Of course the hour of his fall is on the way. It has always come to men who rise from the ranks to supreme leadership. It was true of the man he most resembles, Napoleon. It was true of Roosevelt. It was true of Lloyd George. And it will be true of Mussolini. The man who rises high must be prepared to fall.

THE HUGHES NOTE TO JAPAN

The note of Secretary Hughes to Japan maintained the right and dignity of the United States; and yet gave as little offense to the super-sensitive Japanese, as it was possible to give in a communication so unequivocal in its declaration of our rights.

Secretary Hughes was placed in a very delicate position. It had become known to all the world that he opposed, as did President Coolidge, the Japanese exclusion clause in the immigration bill. The Administration had gone to rather extraordinary lengths in an effort to protect the integrity of the Gentlemen's Agreement between the United States and Japan, under which agreement it was left to the honor of the Japanese government, to restrain its people within certain specified limits of immigration to this country. Supported by some of the best informed American business men and leaders of the churches here, President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes felt that we were preserving a most valued friendship, and committing ourself to no danger whatever, by a maintenance of the statu quo.

But Congress determined otherwise; and, largely because of the injurious utterance of the Japanese ambassador, Hanihara, the exclusion clause became a part of the bill. President Coolidge signed the measure, despite this phase of the enactment; because in his judgment the general provisions were essential for the safety of the country.

Under these circumstances, it is clear that the reply of Secretary Hughes is a most able document. In so far as he could do so without any yielding of our manifest right in the case, the language of his note will mollify the Japanese feeling. But he leaves no doubt that the United States is qualified by her right, and is thoroughly competent to determine for herself, what admissions, if any, she shall make of immigrants from any other land under the sun. We like best in the answer, the fact that it leaves no possible doubt upon the one great point. This nation has the right, and she now shows the intention, to protect herself from overwhelming waves of people holding alien purpose.

We do not feel that there was any serious danger from Japan under the Gentlemen's Agreement; but we do feel that the assertion of our rights in the case was a manifest necessity.

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR THE BOOK

In one quarter at least, humanism has reached its final stage of descent.

The Rev. Charles Francis Potter, pastor of a Unitarian Church in New York, proposes an American Bible to take the place of the Holy Scriptures. He would glorify Abraham Lincoln or Woodrow Wilson in place of Jesus Christ. He would place Jane Addams in his Scripture instead of Deborah, leading in the warfare against moral wrongs. He piles up a list of our political and social reformers into a wild jumble, and indicates that if we are to have any Bible taught in our American schools, it must be an American Bible, with human creatures deified and held up as the examples to our youth.

Some of Dr. Potter's expressions will indicate just how far the learned iconoclast is willing to go. He calls Thomas Paine one of our Prophets. He says that Abraham Lincoln has as full a spiritual appeal to the average patriotic American, as Jesus of Nazareth. In plain words, Mr. Potter says that Abraham Lincoln is "our American social Christ." He asks: "If Jesus was the Prince of peace, may we not equally call Woodrow Wilson the 'protagonist of peace?'" And finally he tells us that we are to find our new American Pentateuch, or first five

books of his modern Old Testament, in the writings of Washington, Adams and Jefferson.

It is not so complimentary to them, as Dr. Potter thinks, to offer these human creatures as substitutes for Jesus of Nazareth.

Except for the Holy Bible—its open pages, its inspiration to the world; except for Jesus Christ the Divine; these glorious human personages would not have risen in America, and there would have been no America as we know it today and in its mighty history.

Our sages, our social and political reformers, our battle leaders stand, in their own right, as examples to all the generations which shall be granted to America. They are the greater because they shine under the reflection from the Divine One. Surely our history can have its own place, without any attempt to displace the Book upon which all our history is founded.

All the men and women named in Dr. Potter's list were decidedly an outgrowth of that reformation which was founded upon the free reading of the Word. There could have been no Thomas Paine or Thomas Jefferson, except for the work which the Bible wrought in the lives of men and in the career of nations.

What the youth of today in this country needs, is not so much human example as an inspiration of Divine truth. The lives of our great and good men, properly understood, may be of very considerable help in moulding the life of American youth. Every thoughtful and conscientious observer knows that we need more and more of this; but we shall never get the youth of America in general, back to the rightful path, unless we show the Divine Spirit enlightenment which came to this country from the Word of God, and the superhuman courage which was animated to go forward and accomplish righteousness in the earth. We need both; the Bible first of all; the splendor of American history and tradition to follow.

HENRY FORD ON THE BIBLE

The latest report from the Ford factory says that the total output to date has passed the mark of 10,000,000 cars.

That is the most wonderful industrial achievement ever attained by one man.

But it is not one half as important to us as the declaration from Henry Ford himself, which appeared in the public press about the time of the announcement from his factory. He says that the Bible ought to be put back into the schools. He says that the men of his generation were reared in schools where principles of justice were taught from the Bible. He says that some of the strongest impressions he ever received of the moral law in the universe, were given in the little country schoolhouse where he attended in his boyhood days.

But finally he tells with mechanical precision his view of the case, in these words:

> The Bible is the basis for instruction in conduct and justice. We learned something in our day that we never forgot. We learned that you suffer if you sin. Maybe someone else suffers also, but you, yourself, suffered anyway. We learned that no one ever gets away with a wrong act. Everything, sooner or later, is checked up. We learned that the universe is so constructed that the wrong thing will be discovered before it goes very far. Such knowledge is the best part of an education, in my judgment.

We venture the assertion that all the pleasure and joy which Henry Ford has given to millions of families in the United States, by producing a car which the every-day man may own and use, does not equal the value which will have been conferred if the same number of families shall heed his advice about the Bible.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND THE GASOLINE TRUST

Under Attorney - General Harlan Fiske Stone, the Government is prosecuting a case against the so-called "gasoline monopoly." Primary defendants are the Standard Oil companies of Indiana and New Jersey, the Gasoline Products Company, the Standard Development Company, and the Texas Company. And in addition there are forty-five secondary defendants.

It is not to be doubted that the Department of Justice found "probable cause," as the law phrase goes. But it is not to be assumed that the bringing of the prosecution is a demonstration of guilt. That issue will be determined in a proper tribunal.

There are two things which may be of more interest to the public than any long drawn out controversy between the Government and the alleged monopoly.

One of them is the prompt action of the new Attorney-General. He is unafraid. He has proceeded in this matter exactly as he would have proceeded in the case of any lesser defendant, leaving to the authorized tribunal the decision as to whether "probable cause" is certain guilt.

The other point of great interest is the fact that one of the secondary defendants is the Pure Oil Company, of which Beeman G. Dawes is president. Beeman Dawes is a brother of Brigadier-General Charles G. Dawes, Republican nominee to the Vice-Presidency, and General Dawes himself is believed to be a heavy stockholder in the Pure Oil Company.

Some politicians are excited over the situation. Republicans are angry at the prosecution. Democrats are exultant. Both sides make too much of it—the Republicans in their fear and the Democrats in their joy.

Nothing can possibly appear in the case which justifies so much political excitement.

If, because of the eminence of any one of its stockholders, a company which breaks a law is not to be prosecuted; then we are in a bad way. Happily no such condition now prevails in the Department of Justice. The Attorney-General is no respecter of persons; he means to vindicate the law.

And, on the other hand, even where the company is guilty—in the primary or secondary sense—of violation of anti-trust laws, it does not follow that there is a necessary legal or moral reflection upon any one of its stockholders.

Our guess is that Charles Dawes will welcome the case, and that he will still the fears of his Republican brethren, and kill the joy of his Democratic opponents.

A GOOD AND TRUE FAIRY TALE

In June 1924, Jamie Brown, a Scotch miner, was Lord High Commissioner to the Church of Scotland, as representative of King George.

That is an interesting circumstance.

Mrs. James Brown, Jamie's dear old Scotch wife, who had cooked the porridge through forty years of their wholesome life of labor, sat with her husband on the throne in Holyrood Palace, at Edinburgh, surrounded by titled ladies-in-waiting.

That latter is the more interesting; because Mrs. Brown, "Her Grace," was as composed as if she had been in her own best room in the thatched cottage where she and Jamie have spent a long and useful and contented life.

And this is the most interesting of all. His Grace, Jamie, and Her Grace, Mrs. Jamie, gave orders that no intoxicating liquors should be served at the state banquets in Holyrood Palace, during their stay.

Jamie is the best James that ever ruled in Holyrood.

INDUSTRIAL GOODWILL IN OPERATION

The spokesmen for 17,000 workers in three of the Standard Oil Company's plants have passed a verdict upon John D. Rockefeller, Jr., which ought to be worth more to that Christian man and gentleman than would have been any laudation by a costly press bureau—such as some other people employ to project their names and their claims upon public attention.

Disputes having arisen between the workmen and the managers of plants, concerning the trend of wages up or down and the relation and absolute character of the wage, a committee of the working people, in a great meeting in Labor Lyceum, Bayonne, New Jersey, adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in whom we have implicit confidence in regard to the welfare of wage earners, has at all times shown that he has the well-being of the men at heart, and has shown just and fair consideration when the question of wages is involved.

We respectfully call upon John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to use his good offices in the present dispute, and to make an investigation of local conditions and the justice of our claims.

This action is not alone a compliment to Mr. Rockefeller. It is a high tribute to the common and uncommon sense of the workingmen themselves. It shows that they are marching on to their opportunity, and to the high ground of justice for all.

Not so long ago, a lot of walking delegates or paid malcontents would have told these workmen that it would be servile to submit the question in dispute to a capitalist; they would have been asked to refuse even mediation from such a source; it would have been urged upon them that if they cared to retain their manhood, they must stand in vociferous hostility to any approach from the company side of the question.

And, in the main, they would have paid dearly for taking such bad advice, just as they would have paid dearly for the bad advisors.

The plan adopted is likely to bring satisfaction and harmony.

When a group of honorable workmen trust their case to an honorable capitalist, there is certain to be an honorable conclusion.

In this incident we see one more glorious example of the value of fraternity and goodwill in our industrial relations.

GUMPTION ON THE BENCH

Judge Garvin of the Federal District Court in New York has found another real solution for the illicit traffic in whisky.

Four men were brought before him, charged with engaging in the whisky traffic. Three of the men were sellers of the stuff and one was a buyer.

The Judge fined the principal bootlegger $500 and the two bartenders $250 each.

Then he fined the buyer $250!

Right then and there the last personal right was crushed under the iron heel of autocracy. The whole fabric of our free civilization shook and tottered, but it soon regained its poise.

The fellow had purchased only two pints of whisky at a cost of $5—$2.50 a pint. With the addition of the fine, the liquor cost him $127.50 a pint—and he lost the liquor.

This is a sure cure if it can be applied with sufficient universality.

Very few people would be willing to pay that much for whisky, and no one would be willing to pay that much if—after the purchase—he should be certain to lose the whisky.

Good judge, Garvin.

AN AMERICAN EAGLE

No one single physical action of modern times more fully demonstrates the indomitableness which is potential in the human spirit, than does the flight of Lieutenant Russell L. Maughan, from New York to San Francisco, on Monday,the 23rd day of June, 1924.

His flying time was eighteen hours and twenty-six minutes, covering a distance of 2,700 miles, the greatest ever traveled by any human creature in that space of time. His stops were only three hours and twenty-three minutes; making a total lapse of time from New York to San Francisco, of twenty-one hours and forty-nine minutes.

One is thrilled into wonder by that flight and aroused to admiration by the mechanical skill which developed a machine that can beat the birds in their own element. But none of these constitutes the most significant and valuable factor.

To realize the marvel of Lieut. Maughan's performance, one must sense all the circumstances. Twice before, he had made the attempt and had failed. With the ordinary human being, these failures would have been disheartening. They only quickened the determination of Lieutenant Maughan. For one year, he had been counting days until he might make another effort. A weaker soul would have become tremulous through that long suspense. Three times, in June of 1924, the undertaking had to be postponed on account of inclement weather; and hour by hour the strain must have increased. When at last the conditions seemed to favor the flight, he took to the air. During that long journey, he had to be in complete command of his faculties. Rain and low-hanging clouds, and cross-winds, and physical nausea—all combined to weaken his purpose and to distract his mind. Think of the contemplation, under these circumstances, of a journey of 2,700 miles—one mile after another, ticking off and registering in his mind.

In this exploit of the air, there was the same kind of quality that was shown by the French at the Marne—a spiritual power superior to all physical and mental tremors.

RAMSAY MACDONALD ON THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH

The Continental Sunday is moving forward against the Christian Sabbath in Great Britain; and Ramsay Macdonald sets his face against the invasion. He says that he would like to see a state of society "where every man and woman prefers the old Scottish Sabbath to the modern French one; because in that state of society you would have fine, solid, eternal foundations of character and self command."

Ramsay Macdonald himself is one of the best demonstrations of the spiritual outgrowth in human life, when there is an observance of God's law for the Sabbath.

The thing which brought Ramsay Macdonald to his present place of power and usefulness for mankind, was not only his strength of will, his clearness of intellect; it was his animation by a spiritual purpose, which owed its development, in part, to a strict observance of God's law concerning the Sabbath.

From out of the wreckage of the world, we see rising these great monitors. Nearly everyone who speaks with any authority or any power of appeal, calls the world to an observance of the immutable laws which Jehovah set for the rule over His human creatures.

The sooner the world shall come to an acceptance of the eternal principles subscribed to by Ramsay Macdonald and other great leaders, the sooner the world will have peace and prosperity. There can be no permanent welfare without the observance of the commandments of Almighty God.

THE GOOD CITIZEN'S RESPONSIBILITY

Marion LeRoy Burton, president of the University of Michigan, is one of the leading advocates of the idea, which is generally spreading among religious leaders, that people who have the right to vote and also the duty to vote, ought to carry their responsibilities under God, to the polls, and cast their ballots for righteous men and righteous government.

There are some strong Christian people in the United States who conscientiously hold to the doctrine of political dissent; and the above argument does not apply to them, since they hold that it is their *duty* not to vote until the Constitution shall recognize Jesus Christ the King.

But the appeal is made to those millions who accept the duty in words, along with a very vociferous assertion of the right; and who yet remain away from the polls, and leave the forces of evil to work their will upon our Government—many times by a mere minority vote.

President Burton says:

> The day must come when the principles of religion are applied to our responsibilities as servants of the public. In a democracy, our civilization must depend upon a high type of intelligence in every community. Moreover, that intelligence must come to expression. Emphasis must be placed, not upon our right to vote, but upon our duty. Whether we like it or not, it is the solemn obligation of everyone who lays claim to the privileges of citizenship in our country, to exercise intelligently his right as a voter.
>
> Sometimes we hear members of the Church express the opinion that the Church's duty is in the field of religion, and that it ought to let politics alone. Any such sharp demarcation between the two fields, reveals a curious and narrow interpretation of religion. I can not conceive of any movement which would be more genuinely significant to our country, than for the Christian churches of the land to make up their mind that every member, through an active and vigorous campaign, would see to it that he performed fully his functions at the ballot box.

Attention has been called by THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN several times in recent years, to the ominous figures which are presented by election returns. And these ominous figures are more than supported by the tragically common selection of unworthy men and measures, through the failure on the part of the God-fearing men and women of the community, to discharge the duty which they have taken upon themselves in the claim of the franchise. Only a few weeks ago, we demonstrated how a minority of a minority had selected the governor of one of the leading states of the Union. In that case a mighty clamor arose from the Wets, acclaiming a great victory for their candidate, who was opposed to the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act. The good people had stayed at home, and seventeen per cent of the voting population of that state had chosen the chief executive. And on the strength of the victory, achieved by less than one-fifth of the voters, the Wets claimed that the nation was turning against prohibition.

This is not the place, nor does the present writer have immediate inclination, for argument with those devoted followers of our Lord, who are conscientious in their political dissent. Many of these have performed a service for the nation, which transcends anything which their individual votes could have done at the ballot box. But one who is a voter—as is the present writer—may feel very free to insist, that people who have the right and the duty to vote, shall exercise their franchise—or shall cease to rail at the evils which they deliberately permit.

We can get good government in the United States and in every state of the Union, as soon as the good people will vote for good candidates and good measures.

RETURN OF A PRODIGAL CHURCH

That pagan church in the Bowery, New York, is about to close down some of its foolish festivals.

It called itself St. Mark's-in-the-Bouwerie, and with that romantic title it surrounded and invested itself with a pagan atmosphere and pagan practices. It was the church which worshipped nature and natural expression. The animal gyrations of the half naked dance in front of the altar, and a few other things of that kind were its devotion to pantheism.

The church quarrelled with Bishop Manning and came under severe condemnation from that prelate. But rather than give up its Hellenic festivals, the church withdrew from the diocese, or at least it threatened to withdraw—it contemplated an independent existence, under the patronage of the curiosity seekers who went there to get a Sabbath Day thrill which was denied to them on account of the closed playhouses of New York.

But some months of vain struggle have demonstrated to St. Mark's-in-the-Bouwerie that the sensation hunters are not willing to pay sufficient money to maintain the spectacle; also most of the Christian contributors have withdrawn their sustenance; and the church is now seeking to come back into regularity.

It may be that, in a multifarious civilization like ours, there is room for just such festivals of beauty and poetry and art as St. Mark's-in-the Bouwerie attempted to present. Not having seen the spectacle, we do not know whether it was intrinsically immoral or not. But any Christian may be quite sure that the whole thing had no place in the house of God at any time, and certainly not as a substitute for the services of piety and reverence which belong in the sacred edifice. So St. Mark's-in-the Bouwerie has had to abandon the exhibition of pagan ritual. It is a failure in its appeal to the sympathy of Christians, and it is a failure in its appeal to the pocket-books of non-Christians.

A MODERATOR AND THE SON OF A MODERATOR

The United Presbyterian General Assembly, at Richmond, Indiana, in May, elected the Rev. Charles H. Robinson of Wheeling, West Virginia, as moderator.

A peculiar interest attaches to this election. Dr. Robinson, himself, is in the highest degree worthy of the honor which was conferred upon him; but, also, he is the son of William J. Robinson, D.D., one of the great leaders of the church in earlier days, and moderator of the General Assembly which met in Philadelphia in 1899. Dr. William J. Robinson was, for twenty-seven years, pastor of the First United Presbyterian Church, North Side, Pittsburgh. Furthermore, he was one of the greatest of the National Reformers of his day, serving on the general committees of the Association, and taking the deepest interest in the spread of its missionary effort in behalf of a submission by the nations to Jesus Christ the King.

Dr. Charles H. Robinson inherits his father's qualities. He is one of the eloquent preachers of his church, and he is also a great organizer of the forces of righteousness.

It was peculiarly fitting that the Assembly which elected Dr. Charles H. Robinson to the distinguished place that had been filled by his father, should also adopt strong resolutions in support of The National Reform Association, to which that eminent father had given so many years of devotion.

Special Correspondence from Mormondom

[Our Monthly Report from Salt Lake City.]

The Mormon invasion of the capital city of the country—our own Washington, D. C.—is about to take a new physical form. Some time ago, Heber J. Grant, the prophet, seer and revelator of the church, gave authority to Apostle Reed Smoot, the senator, to purchase a site for a chapel or a tabernacle at Washington.

It has become necessary to obtain larger premises for the many services which are being held at the capital under the direct patronage of the apostle-senator, and under the instructions from the head of the church. For a long time the Smoot senatorial- apostolic residence served the purpose; but, extensive as are these palatial quarters, it was not deemed that the dignity of the church was sufficiently maintained by having the frequent religious meetings held in the home of an individual, however exalted his rank. Besides, it was desired to impress upon the Washington mind that the Mormon church is in American life to stay.

The old Henderson property, at the corner of Sixteenth Street and Columbia Avenue, has been finally selected. It is in one of the most dignified and conspicuous locations at the capital That spot is a part of the new aristocratic Washington. Around it are rising many notable residences. The Mormon agents could not have selected a more eligible location for their purpose.

Upon the site a classic structure is to be built. In advance, it is modestly called a chapel. Well, it will be an assembly hall of considerable dimensions; with baptismal fonts in the basement, and with prayer circle rooms, and conclave rooms for the higher priests who will gather at Washington from time to time to confer with the apostle-senator during the remainder of his service there. It had been formally announced that President Grant would go to Washington at an early time, to inspect the property and its surroundings, and to give final orders for the building of the chapel.

To one who studies Mormonism and its evolutions as well as its convolutions, the establishment of a place of worship in Washington has more of a significance than would appear to the casual observer.

It is another proof that Mormonism no longer is seeking to huddle to itself in the Zion of the mountains. It wants to spread out, and to establish centers of its influence everywhere throughout the nation.

In all the earlier years, Mormonism taught that the duty and the safety of its people lay in gathering into the modern Jerusalem where they could escape the plagues of the world. Its desire was to maintain its peculiarity. Its prophecy was that the chastisement of the whole world was ready, and that only in Zion was there escape from destruction. It announced the early coming of our Lord, and it prepared temples for His presence and His abiding.

But in these modern times, it has joined the whole world with all its worldly practice, and it has a superlative ambition to rule by worldly means.

The building of chapels or houses of worship in the great centers of this

country, and even in other countries, is a long step toward the setting up of the material power backed by the claim of divine authority. It is noticeable that where a chapel of any significance has been erected by the Mormon church, and where any considerable number of accessions to its faith are procured, the next promise or threat is that a temple is to be built. And wherever a temple is built, there is an outward, arrogant physical assertion of Mormon authority. For the temple is assumed to be built under direct revelation from God. It is assumed to be the council chamber in which God's sole vice-gerent upon earth confers with his appointed priests to carry out God's purpose toward mankind; it is assumed to be a place where Jesus Christ will come as the King of all the earth when He does come—meanwhile his sole prophet and lawgiver, the revelator of the Mormon church, is assumed to act for Him with full authority.

There is a feeling in Mormondom that the resentment against the intrusion of Mormon halls of worship into residential sections is very quickly modified. I think there is some ground for this claim. In the years past, I have heard of many very solemn and some violent protests against the establishment of Mormon chapels or temples in places carefully selected by Mormon agents; and, almost invariably, I have noted that, after the first spasm of indignation has passed, there is no more controversy, and Mormonism goes on its appointed way gathering unto itself local "respectability" and some converts. Its agents spend money in the neighborhood; and the business and professional people come to friendly terms with them. The missionaries gather up the children and give to them Sabbath day instruction and week day festivals. The relief societies look after the poor and needy; and in this way Mormonism by its practice makes itself accepted and its edifice respected, where once public indignation was on fire.

* * * * * *

I encounter another significant change in the attitude of the higher authorities of Mormonism and in their pervasive teaching.

Through nearly three-quarters of a century, Mormonism claimed that the only fully authentic word of God was in the Mormon Scripture: the "Book of Mormon" and "The Pearl of Great Price," translated from ancient plates and manuscripts by direct inspiration from God; and the "Doctrine and Covenants," containing the actual words of God delivered to the Mormon prophet.

The Bible took a secondary place. Of this Book, the Mormon creed stated that it was accepted in so far as it had been translated correctly. By this phrase, the Mormon church gave to it a subordinate place, and assumed to be able to dismiss any part of the teaching of the Holy Scripture if it were found to be inconsistent with Mormon purpose. Through its nearly one hundred years of history, the Mormon church has never ventured to tell wherein the Bible was translated correctly or incorrectly; and therefore its attitude has been absurd as well as heretical from a Christian viewpoint.

But all at once the Mormon church has changed front.

In the *Deseret News,* the official organ of the church, June 7, 1924, on the editorial page, appears an article under the title "Bible Thoughts." This article purports to give the story of eight well-defined volumes that have been regarded as sacred by certain groups of believers. Among these eight, are named the Bible and the "Book of Mormon."

And the closing sentence of that article is as follows: "The Bible is the grandest of all the sacred records. It

s the true foundation of all excellent vritings and useful acts."

In that sentence, Mormonism relinquishes its entire claim of nearly one undred years.

And yet so quietly is the idea put orward that scarcely one of its believers will be challenged. In point of act, its masses of people do not read ttentively.

But it is perfectly plain now, that he Mormon church intends to make gradual recession with regard to he "Book of Mormon," and to substiute the Bible for that profane and oolish fraud.

There are several reasons why this nust be done if Mormonism is to grow r even to hold its place.

The first is that the "Book of Mornon" and "The Pearl of Great Price" re absolutely disproved by researches f experts and scholars. In the long run, ven the educated Mormons would ave to reject them. The Mormon hurch is getting ready for such reection by its own growing scholarship; nd, by the time it would otherwise e endangered, it will have transferred he entire thought of its people from he "Book of Mormon" to the Bible.

The second reason is that the "Book f Mormon," after nearly one hundred ears, still remains a thing of deadly ullness to Mormons as well as non-Mormons. It cannot make its way even s a romance.

And the third reason is that Mornonism is trying to break into evanelical Christianity. After all its anathma against the Christian world, it as now come to a position where it vould be glad to be counted a Chrisian sect.

* * * * *

If the declaration concerning the Bible, which I have quoted in a foreoing part of this article, is properly nderstood by readers of THE CHRISIAN STATESMAN; and if I can convey to these readers the necessary social implications which follow such a statement by the official organ of the church, they will understand a good deal of the psychology of Mormonism which makes this problem a most complicated one.

In that one sentence, obscurely printed (but printed for a large and evident purpose), Mormonism is renouncing its special claims.

Imagine such a situation in any other church. What a furore would be created!

I predict that in this case there will not be a ripple. Mormonism is so used to changing its front that its own people are not shocked by the most extraordinary reversals of its own proclamations of faith and its own practices.

That statement concerning the Bible is a direct contradiction of more than three quarters of a century of special teaching in the Mormon church; and probably not one elder of the Mormon church will even make an inquiry concerning it.

You can see, therefore, how difficult is the problem which Christian teachers in America confront, when they attempt to deal with this thing which changes its colors like the chameleon.

Mormonism would not be dangerous if it were not so shrewdly led. The sole purpose of Mormonism is to aggrandize Mormon leadership and power. It is developing a whole community of people who have no greater object than to enhance the material prosperity of Mormonism, in which they are to have a share. This will apply even to non-Mormons who are resident within the range of Mormon power.

And these contradictions, which would arouse laughter or indignation in any other community, are accepted here as a part of the great game which Mormonism is playing upon the world.

Sympathy and Admiration for President and Mrs. Coolidge

By George Quayle

The sable messenger of death has summoned the younger of the two sons of President and Mrs. Coolidge, and has borne him away while still the prayerful father and mother were pleading that his life might be spared.

In this grievous affliction which Providence has visited upon the President and his family, the whole nation will give a deep and tender sympathy, and will trust that the comfort of the All Comforter may be with the stricken ones and that their sorrow may be sanctified to them for their and the nation's good.

So much I want to say in most profound and gentle regard for the parental grief. Like most men of my age, I have had to undergo just such suffering. And I know.

But, also in fullest respect and tenderness, I may turn from the exclusive contemplation of this immediate sorrow, to make some comment upon the way in which the Coolidges were seeking to rear their sons.

It was like their good old stock to say that their boys must be reared in a wholesome atmosphere and with an ever present sense of duty and responsibility. The higher the station of the parents, the greater the temptation upon the youth, the more definite and high-minded had to be the plan of life. I wish that there could be put into the hearts and minds of all the parents in the United States, an appreciation of what Calvin Coolidge and his good wife were seeking to do with their boys in order to fit them for citizenship in this republic and in the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All over this land, parents in ordinary circumstances, and in extraordinary circumstances too, are allowing their boys to run riot. The youth of sixteen is "telling the cock-eyed world" what he will do and what he won't do; and his terrified or overawed parents sit helplessly still, and let him do or let him not do, according to his will and wont. Nearly anywhere, you may see a sixteen year old driving his own fast car and staying out until all hours at night, cutting classes if he have school work to do, and cutting loose from everything else that is worth while in life.

When President Coolidge had his boys at the White House, he gave stern and irrevocable notice that they were not to be paraded in the movies; that they were not to be written up by special correspondents; but that they were to be permitted to lead the wholesome, moral life of American boys with a proper sense of coming responsibility. And the whole world took notice.

It would be a great thing if the rest of the people of the country would bring up their sons under a similar combination of conscience and sense. Other fathers and mothers have, if they would only use it, the same power of parental authority. Strange as it may seem to some browbeaten parents, it is not actually necessary to mortgage the home and jeopardize the whole family welfare, in order that a spoiled boy may have a motor car and unlimited spending money.

In youth is all the potentiality of power and sweetness and helpfulness and happiness.

But in youth, also, is all the potentiality of sin and sorrow and horror and despair.

The Coolidges chose the right method to develop the powers of their sons along lines of exalted righteousness.

* * * * * *

Though we bow to the inevitable and say that "He doeth all things well," the death of young Calvin Coolidge is, from our limited human viewpoint a sad calamity. But in the innocent, cleancut life of this splendid boy, and in the method of parental discipline which had kept that life unstained, there is a lesson that would ennoble the grief in his death if only the people of the United States could learn it.

While President and Mrs. Coolidge boy's life, millions of prayers were were praying to God to spare their mingling with theirs. They may have the knowledge that all the human sympathy that can be extended to human grief, is flowing out to them. And they may have the mightiest consolation that can come in such sorrow as theirs. The Lord on high called their boy for His own.

THE VATICAN AND THE WORLD WAR

At the great conference of the Methodist Episcopal church in Springfield, Massachusetts, in May, Bishop Blake made some very impressive remarks concerning the Catholic church in Europe. He has charge of the administration of the Methodist work over there and he knows whereof he speaks. The open hostility and the secret intrigue of the Church of Rome are matters with which he ought to deal when making report to his church; and he discharges that duty with candor and courage.

In the course of one of his addresses, Bishop Blake stated that the Vatican did its best to bring on the World War.

A mighty uproar has followed. Catholic clergy and Catholic press demand the proof—the proof, the proof.

Indisputable evidence is available. It could be piled to interminable height.

But one testimony, and the comment thereupon, are all that is necessary for the purpose of this article:

Helmuth von Gerlach has published in the *Journal du Ligue de Droits de l'Homme* the full text of a telegram, *official*, which was sent from Rome, July 24, 1914. It was dispatched by Herr von Ritter, at that time the Bavarian minister to the Vatican, and was addressed to the Bavarian foreign minister at Munich. The English translation of that message is as follows:

> The Pope approves the energetic action of Austria against Serbia, and in case of war has not much confidence in the Russian and French armies. The Cardinal Secretary of State, Merry del Val, hopes that this time Austria will stand firm. He asks, when she can make war, whether she is not resolved to repulse with arms the foreign agitation which has resulted in the murder of the heir of the throne, which in view of the present situation endangers the very existence of Austria.

Any intelligent reader with a good memory, who can cast his mind back to that momentous time, July 1914, will realize that this was an encouragement and practically a papal instruction to make war. Commenting upon the text of that dispatch, Hon. Gilbert O. Nations, editor of *The Protestant*, Washington, D. C., says:

> When the foregoing telegram was dispatched the Hapsburg Roman Catholic Empire had the previous day served its ultimatum on little non-Roman Catholic Serbia, one-twentieth its size, and was demanding answer the next day. The world was stupefied by the sudden and amazing step thus taken by the Vienna Kaiser. But the Vatican rejoiced in the hope that it would lead to bloody war.
>
> It seems clear that both the Vatican and Vienna, as well as Berlin, then fully expected, and had definitely planned, that the war would involve France and Russia, and would wreck modern and progressive civilization throughout the world. The Roman Catholic envoy to the Vatican assured the Roman Catholic government of Bavaria that the Pope ardently hoped the big Roman Catholic Hapsburg bully would stand on the ultimatum and thus shatter Europe.

Protestant Unification Defined

Primarily, The National Reform Association advances three propositions—Protestant propositions—upon which it believes all Protestants can unite.

First, the recognition of the kingship of our Lord Jesus Christ, over the world and all its institutions.

Second, the reading of the Bible in every public school every day.

Third, the recognition of the holy Sabbath day by statute, and the observance of the Sabbath day by administration.

It seems to be desirable to reiterate for a few, what most of our friends understand.

The National Reform Association's great campaign for Protestant unification has no relation whatever to any organic union between denominational branches of Protestantism. Such organic union or attempt for it, lies solely within the province of the church.

The campaign does not contemplate —indeed it does not permit—any attack upon any race or any creed. It insists that there shall be no persecution and no intolerance. It recognizes the right of every non-Protestant element in this country, to stand for its own rights.

Unification of Protestantism, as urged and as now going forward in this campaign, means that all Protestants shall be alert and determined in the maintenance of Protestant rights in this Protestant nation. It holds that there must be no overthrow of Protestant rights, and no insidious undermining of these rights.

Surely Protestants have as good a right to maintain the Protestant right, as non-Protestants have to claim their rights.

Primarily, The National Reform Association advances three propositions—Protestant propositions—upon which it believes all Protestants can unite.

First, the recognition of the kingship of our Lord Jesus Christ, over the world and all its institutions.

Second, the reading of the Bible in every public school every day.

Third, the recognition of the holy Sabbath day by statute, and the observance of the Sabbath day by administration.

There is no invasion of the right of any human creature, no matter what his race or creed, in this assertion of the Protestant rights in this Protestant nation.

Upon such ground the campaign is going forward, gathering zeal and strength.

The Protestants of America will never discharge their debt to the founders of the Republic; they will never discharge their obligation to the great reformers whose work made the Republic possible; they will never fulfill the responsibility placed upon them by Jehovah, unless they stand firm and unafraid in this Protestant nation for the Protestant rights—with malice toward none, with love for all; unifying a citizenship which can maintain America as the chosen nation of the Lord—a Protestant nation.

LOYAL PROTESTANTS

Upon this page is printed a little coupon "For Protestant Unity." Signatures are pouring into THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN office from every part of the country. You can clip the coupon from this issue of your magazine, or you can get any number of coupons for yourself and your friends to sign, by sending a letter of request to THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, Publication Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Among the pledges received since last report, are those of the following named persons, with many more names yet to be printed.

M. Elizabeth Ellis, Brooklyn, N. Y.
R. M. Ellis, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Clara Ellis, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Mary Elizabeth Ellis, Brooklyn, N. Y.
A. Terstegge, Newark, N. J.
Mrs. James Melton, Bagdad, Fla.
Margaret Melton, Bagdad, Fla.
Mrs. Ella F. Brown, Syracuse, N. Y.
Sue Hopkins, Melbourne, Fla.
Mr. and Mrs. John Bauer, Vandergrift, Pa.
Miss Sarah E. Watts, Newport, R. I.
H. W. Miller, Cleveland, Ohio.
J. B. Whittin, Palmyra, N. J.
Mrs. Samuel H. Cook, McDonald, Pa.
Marie Hendrich, Avalon, Pa.
E. A. C. Niven, Buell, Va.
Venia S. Porter, McDonald, Pa.
Mrs. Alma Broughton, Eldred, Pa.
Mrs. M. F. Russell, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Herman Hawkins, Chicago, Ill.
Benjamin Sears, Annapolis, Md.
Anna Marshall, Indianapolis, Ind.
May Keltner, Anderson, Ind.
Arch W. Keltner, Anderson, Ind.
L. P. Keltner, Anderson, Ind.
Maude Keltner, Anderson, Ind.
J. B. Lott, Anderson, Ind.
Chas. Daugherty, Anderson, Ind.
M. C. Reed, Anderson, Ind.
Mrs. M. C. Reed, Anderson, Ind.
Mrs. J. B. Lott, Anderson, Ind.
Anna Ellis, Anderson, Ind.
John W. Douglas, Anderson, Ind.
J. Turner, Anderson, Ind.
M. A. Marshall, Indianapolis, Ind.
Eva Feierabend, Louisville, Ky.
Ethel Ford, Yarmouthville, Me.
Geo. A. Heath, Muskegon, Mich.
Mrs. J. V. Morey, Ridgewood, N. J.
Mr. J. V. Morey, Ridgewood, N. J.
Miss G. E. Morey, Ridgewood, N. J.
Mr. V. B. Morey, Ridgewood, N. J.
Rev. Earl L. Stehman, Avella, Pa.
Ada MacElree, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. C. Britten, West Fairview, Pa.
Cora E. Britten, West Fairview, Pa.
Mrs. T. B. Galbraith, Brookville, Pa.
William Wilson, Carnegie, Pa.
L. A. Cochran, Ingram, Pa.
Mrs. J. H. Sipe, Harrisonburg, Va.
J. B. Bosworth, Lynchburg, Va.
Carrie Hope,
Minerva Hope,
Rachel Hope.

FOR PROTESTANT UNITY

Do you believe in Protestant ideals and institutions? Do you desire their protection and perpetuation? Clip this Coupon and send it to The National Reform Association, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. On request you may also obtain as many pledges as you desire for signature by your friends.

This is a Christian nation.

This is a Protestant Christian nation.

Its ideals and its institutions—its laws and its customs are Protestant.

I favor a closer unification of Protestants for the maintenance of the Protestant character of this nation.

_____

_____

_____

The Centrifugal Democratic Convention

By Benjamin Jenne

While I am writing this for the August number of The Christian Statesman, the Democratic Convention is still in deadlock.

In order to conform to the proprieties of political language, I call it a convention. But it is not a convention to gravely consider issues and to prayerfully select a candidate who shall stand as a minister for God at the head of this republic. It never was intended to be such a convention. It was taken to New York by the party bosses, in pursuance of a definite plot. Al Smith's managers wanted to surround the delegates with the New York atmosphere (and according to stories which have come out, some of that atmosphere was vile), and to overawe the delegates with noise and racket and turbulence in behalf of the Wet governor of Wet New York.

In making the platform, it was expediency which was mainly considered. True, there is more of a progressive note than appears in the Republican platform—upon some points. But past experience with Democratic as well as Republican platforms indicates that the platform is like the platform of a railway train—a thing to get in on and not to stand on.

What surprises and disgusts me is that the Smith management has been able to make combination with favorite sons from all quarters, against so good a man as McAdoo. He is not the best man who could be chosen, but he is a good man, better than many of the other candidates—and infinitely better than Al Smith, for many, many reasons. When the favorite sons and their backers went into the Al Smith combine to destroy McAdoo and his chance for the nomination, they were doing a most despicable thing and a dangerous thing for the Democratic party. The insolence of the Smith management should have put the delegates from other states on their guard. Almost from the beginning, there was a demand that McAdoo should retire—although he was the leading candidate. This is a bit of arrogance quite unusual even in such extraordinary gatherings as political conventions. That a man who had nearly one-half the votes in the convention should be asked to retire from his candidacy, and that all the burden of delay and all the odium and all the vituperation should be directed at him, is as senseless a proceeding as it is insolent. Nothing but the backing of a large segment of the press could have made this possible.

At present the whole thing seems nearly hopeless. And nothing but some intervention, scarcely to be expected in such a Democratic Convention, can help the people of the United States so far as the work of the Democratic party is concerned. I wish that the party would select Bryan; he is the strongest man; he is a leader; he is a man of God; the people believe in him; and he might be elected. But these very reasons which would seem to point to the selection of William J. Bryan, constitute the one great reason why this Democratic Convention, controlled by bosses and manipulated in the interests of Al Smith, will not nominate Bryan.

The Wet Democrats prefer Al Smith and defeat, to William J. Bryan and victory.

If the Democratic party does as now appears probable, there is still relief for such of us as do not feel like

voting the Republican ticket. We can go to a third, fourth or fifth party, or we can support the independent candidacy of LaFollette.

Certainly there are some millions of God fearing Democrats in the United States, who are not willing to be led by Brennan, Taggart and Al Smith, in a combination of the Wets with other evil forces which threaten our Protestant civilization.

I am not projecting the religious question into this matter. The supporters of Al Smith have dragged that issue into the open. From the beginning they have seemed to assume that Al Smith was being opposed because he was a Catholic; they have said that it was religious bigotry to fight against him; and, in their very assumption and assertion, they have made it plain that a considerable share of the support given to Al Smith is given because he is a Catholic.

If this plot of the Democratic bosses shall be successful and a candidate of Al Smith's type shall be nominated, the party is due for such an overwhelming defeat as it has not suffered in this generation. If necessary to overcome such a plot, all the real Protestants would vote for Calvin Coolidge and Charles G. Dawes. And so Protestant America would be saved.

DR. SCOTT ACCEPTS NEW POST

A great accession has been made to the Department of Welfare of the State of Pennsylvania, through the appointment of the Rev. B. L. Scott, as Director of the Bureau of Restoration within the department.

Dr. Scott has long been interested in social service work; and the particular responsibility and authority laid upon him under this new appointment, will give opportunity for the exercise of his great talents and his vivid humanity. He will deal directly with the officials and trustees of prisons; and it is not to be doubted, that in his labors the whole of society will find benefit—for his work will be to give suggestions and help by which broken lives can be restored.

In accepting his office, to which his entire time and energy must be devoted, Dr. Scott was obliged to separate himself from his labors directly with The National Reform Association —although he will continue to be its good friend and its advocate. With his departure from the place of manager of the Department of Field Work, he carries with him the very best wishes, hopes, and prayers of all his fellow-workers, to whom he had become endeared by his fortitude, his zeal, and his unfailing courtesy.

Both the State of Pennsylvania and —in a wider sense—social service in the nation, will gain a splendid ability and a high devotion in the labors of Dr. Scott.

REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD REAFFIRMS ITS SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION

At the meeting of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, at Winona Lake, Indiana, June 5-12, the report of The National Reform Association was read and accepted, and the Synod voted a recommendation to the congregations, that they contribute $10,000 to the Association, during the year.

Dr. James S. McGaw, General Secretary and Acting General Superintendent, addressed the Synod on the work of the Association, and offered grateful acknowledgments for the general financial help which has been rendered in the past, and which was accorded in prospect for the future.

Covenanter individuals and Covenanter congregations have been most generous in their support of this work, through more than sixty years.

A Big Second Fiddle

By Ernest Turner Mason

I have been voting independently for many years, and probably my conventional Republican friends would call me a Democrat—on the ground that anybody who is not for the Republican machine must of necessity be against it, and therefore is a Democrat or an anarchist. But, because I am an independent, I like this man Charles G. Dawes. He talks right out in meeting, as a brave, conscientious man ought to talk. He is as distinctively American as was Theodore Roosevelt; and he has some additional qualities which attract my admiration.

In the first place, he has no political aspiration that is not equalled by his consciousness of public responsibility. In all his career there has been no act or word, so far as I know, which could be construed as an assumption that public office is a private snap; and particularly for the exploitation or enrichment of the officeholder. This is the very basis of public integrity. In this matter I have been speaking solely of the relation of the citizen office seeker, and the citizen who holds the electoral franchise which will create the citizen official who is to administer the affairs of the citizen elector. Of course there is always in my mind the higher thing—the obligation of both citizen office seeker and citizen elector, to recognize the supreme right of Jehovah over the nation and all its affairs. I cannot speak with any knowledge of the devotion by General Dawes to this exalted ideal. I do not know. But I would rather have Dawes, with his plain blunt honesty, seeking to serve the people and, through that service, paying an unconscious deference to the God who rules on high; than to see a man give lip service to the Almighty and action service to the devil.

So, if we are to judge Dawes by his conduct and not by any mere profession, he will be a good public servant if elected; and therefore will be a minister, under God, of the people. I hope that he makes the acknowledgment on his knees in prayer, because he will be the stronger, if he shall seek the help of Jehovah, and if he shall acknowledge his submission to the Divine Power.

I like Mr. Dawes because he has always pursued a straight course. He has no sympathy with devious ways, nor with the circumlocution which is as dishonest, in its final effects, as if it were venal. General Dawes knows that what the people of the United States want is direct action by the Government. They liked his establishment of the budget system. If he is elected to the Vice-Presidency, they hope that his very presence in Washington will bring about the enforcement of that budget system in our governmental expenditures.

Americans like the way in which General Dawes settled the terms of reparation, and approved the plan by which reparations can be paid by Germany to the other nations. He was Rooseveltian in his method, but far more practical and effective than Roosevelt would have been under the same circumstances. He went straight to the mark—the German mark. And his policies will lift the mark back into its usefulness to the German people and its power of compensation to the rest of the world. We might have appointed a commission which would have been laboring ten years hence, to find its way through the difficulties which it would have created for itself.

I call the Dawes method of dealing with practical questions a triumph for common sense and courage and mental integrity. He is an honest thinker and therefore he is an honest doer.

We have not been in the habit of selecting Vice-Presidents for presidential candidates. But if Dawes shall be elected to the Vice-Presidency, and if he shall be as useful in the promotion of common sense government as his intellect would prompt him to be, he may be fully equipped by the end of four years for the higher place—not only in his own character but in the affections which the good people of this country will hold for him.

COOLIDGE AND DAWES CREDIT TO THEIR PARTY

By James Ellington Mason

From the Republican viewpoint, no better ticket could be offered to the country than Coolidge and Dawes.

The inevitability of the Coolidge nomination left us merely room to speculate concerning the selection of the running mate for the head of the ticket.

Of all the candidates available, and willing to accept, General Charles G. Dawes probably gives the most strength.

At any rate the people of the country may be congratulated upon one thing. There is no straddling—with a platform on one side and the ticket on the other; nor with the Presidential candidate on one side of the fence and the Vice-Presidential candidate on the other, in any assumption that the two holding divergent views, can pull two antagonistic groups of votes into the Republican camp.

This is a step which for many years I have desired to see. The natural division of the United States is between Conservatives and Progressives. The Republican platform, with Calvin Coolidge and Charles G. Dawes as the candidates, is distinctly a start toward the formation of a Conservative party. The platform holds to policies which, without being reactionary, are certainly not tainted by any undue Progressiveism.

And the candidates are the very apotheosis of safety. Totally different in disposition and method, yet their experiences have been alike; and the opinions of both on the social compact and upon much in governmental policy, are alike demure.

If now we could have another party in the United States, representing as clearly Progressiveism or radicalism—if one choses to call it the latter, the people would have a chance to choose between policies, one of which trends toward the making of a new social order, and the other toward the maintenance of existing social order.

But I greatly fear that there will be no such conclusive alignment.

The Democratic party, itself, is the mingling of Conservatism and radicalism in the old attempt to hold irreconcilable groups, in one body for election day.

But whatever the Democratic party—or a third party—shall do, we who desire clarity in political issues may count ourselves very well satisfied in the presentation which the Republican party makes. There is less buncombe in the platform than usual; there is practically no equivocation; there is no promise which is impossible of fulfillment. And the candidates are as trusty as any men who have ever been offered for high office in the nation.

I am Progressive in my political views.

But, for my country, and for myself as a citizen, I would rather see trustworthy Calvin Coolidge and Charles G. Dawes elected on a definite Conservative platform, knowing that the loyalty, the energy, and the ability of two mighty Americans would be given to the maintenance of a definite policy of government; than to see the victory of any party or any faction or any group of factions, holding such adverse and antagonistic views that we should get neither progress nor conservation, but only four years more of bitter wrangling.

EDITORIAL

A SUPER-HORROR IN POLITICS

A horrible story came out of New York during the Democratic Convention, to the effect that the Al Smith leaders were using whisky and women to coax delegates over into the Smith camp. The tale was told with some substantiality through a Chattanooga, Tennessee paper, by the editor, who wired it from New York.

If this story is false, the editor ought to be incarcerated for criminal libel, and his paper ought to go into absolute oblivion.

And, if it is true, every person connected with the unspeakable, vile plan, and every person who consciously accepted any of the votes thus procured, ought to be driven out of any political party which dares to seek the suffrage of the decent people of the United States.

HUMAN ANTS

Jan C. Smuts, a veteran of the Boer War against the English, and a general in the World War for the English, emerged from the awful strife a full-bodied statesman in the estimate of the whole civilized world. As premier for South Africa, he has worked continuously and effectively for the highest ideals of national integrity and international friendship. Outside of Lloyd George himself, there was no more potent voice within the British Empire.

General Smuts had practical ability along with his great vision, and he was leading his people along a line of safe progress.

But the exigencies and jealousies of politics, the conflicts between the old Boer element and the newer English element, and the constant friction involving the native African element—issues between capital and labor, as well as land questions; all together have caused his overthrow in the recent elections.

We human beings are like Lubbock's ants. We destroy our victorious leaders.

BRYAN'S STRENGTH

As fervent and as courageous as Daniel of old, is our own William J. Bryan.

In the Democratic Convention at New York, when the whole mass was seething with hate and animosity, Mr. Bryan arose and offered to lead the convention in prayer.

These are his words:

> O Lord, in this hour of extremity, when the future of the party and even our Government seems to rest in the balance, look down upon us in Thine all-understanding. Calm our passions. Free us of our prejudices. Restore harmony in our councils. Give us wisdom to see the right, and courage to do the right. Help us, we humbly beseech Thee, to solve this problem for the good of our party and our country. In Jesus' name, Amen.

Bryan's courage and piety have been a precious gift to the people of the United States. It is his possession of these qualities which makes him a leader among men. Not all the political hates that were ever directed against any man—and they have often combined against this man—can destroy Bryan while he holds this faith in God and has the bravery to stand in humble supplication and in the name of Jesus Christ.

"His strength is as the strength
of ten,
Because his heart is pure."

A SQUALL OVER THE GREAT LAKES

Our friends over in Canada have become aroused—and none too soon, over the equal right which Canada assumes in the Great Lakes, which lie at the border between the United States and Canada.

The city of Chicago has been dealing with Lake Michigan as if that lake were her own. Waters have been diverted in order to effect drainage and sanitary conditions; also Chicago is proposing a canal from Chicago to the Gulf of Mexico, to be fed by waters from the lake.

Against such diversions, Canada now protests through the British Embassy at Washington. The Dominion government holds that the lakes are the common heritage of the people of Canada and the United States, and that no special or exclusive proprietorship must be practiced or asserted by this country.

Lake Michigan does not make a part of the boundary, but it is supplied by lakes which do constitute the boundary. It is fed in large degree from Superior and Huron; and it is upon this ground that Canada will seek to maintain her protest.

There should have been no opportunity for the raising of this issue. For many years the United States and Canada have maintained two commissions. One is called the International Boundary Commission, whose duty is to define and mark boundary lines between the United States and Canada, except that of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. The other is called the International Joint Commission, which has for its United States members, three former senators. Assumedly, the International Joint Commission takes under its purview all those boundary matters which are withheld from the Boundary Commission.

We have been carrying a heavy expense in these commissions. The places on them are regarded as fat feeding for the lame ducks in politics.

Surely, with years of authority and with hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense, our Boundary Commission and Joint Commission ought to have been able to settle the question, without its having to come now into the realm of dispute and into an interminable and costly diplomatic negotiation.

To a plain man, it would seem that Lake Michigan belongs to the United States; and, to a plain man, it would seem that no serious injury could be done to the Canadian rights in Huron or Superior by drawing off any possible quantity of water through a canal leading from Chicago to the Gulf. But the plainer the whole thing seems to a plain man, the more surprise may be expressed that such common sense propositions were not settled one way or the other, long ago, by our Commissions which have been drawing rich sustenance from our public revenues.

TRIPLE ALLIANCE OF COMMON SENSE

Two other big men are agreeing with our Brigadier-General Dawes. They are Ramsay Macdonald, the British prime minister, and M. Herriot, the French premier. It is the desire of these gentlemen, and it will be a part of their assiduous plan, to bring the other entente allies, and even Germany, to an acceptance of the reparation plan submitted by the Dawes commission.

Herein is justification for the new hope that the world may be set right. Common sense met common sense when Dawes reached Macdonald and Herriot; and if these two men can eject hate and imbecility from the minds of the other statesmen of Europe, we may get a basis for peace.

WHY YOUTH GOES INSANE

Enough — perhaps too much — has been written in the newspapers concerning the personal aspects in that most outrageous and sensational murder case of recent years, upon which is fixed the attention of half the people of this country.

There is the claim that the murderers were insane.

If so, theirs is but a part of a general insanity, which probably ought to have no power to mitigate the decree or the execution of the law.

The state of mind of the murderers was but the logical effect of the speed madness of today, acting upon minds which were overdone in self-expression and underdone in self-discipline. That is all there is to it.

These persons had run through the ordinary education of youth; they had exhausted the ordinary emotions of youth; they had passed the speed limits which ought to be set upon youth; and they had gone beyond all conventions in their search for sensations—at any cost to others. It is noticeable that they had a perfectly sane regard for themselves and their feelings.

We count a part of the speed madness of today, which transgresses all laws, as having been induced in part by mechanical development far beyond our power of assimilation or accommodation, and far beyond the enlarged sense of moral responsibility which should accompany the greater power.

And we count the whirlwind of assault upon the Eighteenth Amendment, as having been an equally contributory cause.

And, finally, we count the license granted to young people by their elders, to pursue pleasure, day and night, wherever the youthful fancy may chance to stray—regardless of morals and regardless of physical safety—as being still another part of the same cause.

Let us view one of these causes and see if the argument is sound.

When the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act went into operation, there was, in general throughout the United States, a feeling of voluntary or of compelled acceptance. If, then, the whole intelligence and conscience of the country had been devoted to a maintenance of the law, it would by this time have been observed as generally as are other statutes in the land. But a considerable share of the public press, and a great many political leaders and several of the so-called ethical publicists, joined in a vast conspiracy to overthrow the statute; and by their arguments they promoted the practical nullification of the Constitution. It was pointed out, early in this sad experience, that the very nature of the attempt made, and the argument offered by these people, would be to destroy in the rising generation a respect for the conventional things, including the law. By every beseeching which could go into speech and print, these people were urged to cease their dangerous action and their still more dangerous utterance, and to stand for the maintenance of the law. They were advised that the young people of the country were taking license from this anarchistic assault, directed from high places against the Constitution and the statutes; and that if the few vicious and the many ignorant and reckless among the young people, were to follow a natural bent, they would plunge into excesses, surely fatal to themselves, and threatening fatality to all the things which the nation had learned to approve.

It is our firm belief that the massed attack made upon the Volstead Act from places of so-called respectability in this country, is in large degree responsible for the madness—the reckless, murderous madness of these times.

A CANDID CANDIDATE

Here are some of the bold ideas uttered by one of the candidates for nomination to the Presidency, to show the convention and the country where he stands:

"No, I shall not make a further statement. Everybody knows where I stand. It is up to the other side to make its position clear."

Being asked by his press bureau, "What is a Progressive?", the candidate stroked his chin and replied: "My idea of a progressive is a man who stands for progressive ideas. If you want to see an example of progressive principles, read my message of last year."

With such complete enlightenment concerning the candidate's views, no voter need be in any doubt.

THE WHISKY BUSINESS AND ITS WICKED KIN

Police officials are able to trace clearly the connection between bootlegging and burglary. The Government secret service finds the same tie between whisky running and train robbing. And it should not be difficult for bankers and financiers to discover that the whole illicit whisky business is a stimulus to bank banditry.

So what follows?

Any banker or business man who has been giving any kind of support to the illicit whisky trade in the United States, whether as financial backer or as a customer of the infernal stuff, has been actually promoting attacks upon his own property interests.

If these so-called respectable members of society have no respect for law, if they have no regard for morals, if they have no sense of duty toward the coming generation; perhaps they may be induced to remit their selfish and insane promotion of the whisky business, by the consciousness that the more they drink and the more they encourage violations of the law in other ways, the more attacks they are inviting upon their own lives and property.

If patriotism will not stay them, perhaps prudence and parsimony may be effective.

The whisky business has a lot of wicked relatives—and supports them all.

LYMAN E. DAVIS, EDITOR

At the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant church, at Tiffin, Ohio, June 7, 1924, Rev. Lyman E. Davis, D.D., LL.D., was, by unanimous vote, re-elected editor of the *Methodist Recorder*. In paying this tribute of confidence and admiration, the Conference honored itself and the magnificent body of Christians of which it was the official voice.

Dr. Davis is one of the great literary lights of the Church of Christ. With his books and poems and general magazine work, he has attained high rank. His work has a quality rarely approached in these days, and is appreciated in both church and secular circles, by people who love exalted sentiment and beautiful phrasing.

The fame of the *Methodist Recorder* and its scholarly editor extends not only throughout the Methodist Protestant church, but far beyond the numerical strength of that great denomination, because of the admiration which the magazine elicits in every editorial office which receives a copy.

The National Reform Association feels an especial interest in this recognition of Dr. Davis by the Conference of his church, because of the happy fact that he is one of the Directors of this Association, and also a member of its Committee on Publication, serving in both these offices out of the abundance of his inspiring zeal for the Kingdom.

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF OUR SABBATH LAWS

A careful analysis of our Sabbath laws produces the conviction that the alleged right not to keep the Sabbath religiously, is better protected than the right to keep it religiously. This is a proposition, however, which demands fuller consideration than has yet been given it. The effort will now be made to give it due consideration, by setting forth the strength and weakness of our Sabbath laws. We have become quite accustomed to hearing the complaints of the foes of the Sabbath. The belief has become common that it is difficult, if not impossible, to have a real Sabbath law at all, without invading the rights of the irreligious classes. Let us examine these laws as they now exist, and see where the truth lies.

In presenting the facts which embody the good and strong points of these laws, the first thing that claims attention is the fact that forty-six of the forty-eight states of the Union, have laws designed to safeguard the weekly rest day. And what is especially noteworthy about these laws, is the further fact that, without an exception, they designate the first day of the week as the day of rest. No one with even the most superficial knowledge of Church history, doubts or denies the Christian origin of the custom of observing the first day of the week as a sacred day, in memory of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And no one doubts or denies the Christian origin of our rest day laws, safeguarding the right of Christians to observe this day religiously. Misrepresentation of these laws, and attacks made upon them, are expressions of a spirit of vandalism, that bodes nothing but evil for our most sacred political and religious institutions.

The terms used in designating the day thus set apart as a day of rest, deserve more than a passing notice. As might be expected, the word Sunday is the one most commonly used. This word is of heathen origin, and expresses no religious thought, except that it was the name of the day anciently set apart for the worship of the sun. Since many of the converts to Christianity in the early Christian centuries came in from heathenism, they continued to use this term as the name of the first day of the week. It is quite difficult, however, for many Christians to attach a Christian idea to this name, on account of its heathen origin. But the term "Lord's Day," is of frequent occurrence in our Sabbath laws, and this is the specific name given the day in the New Testament. It is the name which links the observance of the day directly with the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The use of it in our laws in an indirect acknowledgment of His Lordship. It is an acknowledgment that this day is His, in a very special sense, and that it should be devoted exclusively to activities which bring honor to His name.

The name "Sabbath," however, as a designation of the day of rest, occurs even more frequently in our Sabbath laws than does the name "Lord's Day." It is sometimes offered as an objection to the use of this term, that it is the proper designation of the seventh day of the week, and that, since there are still people who observe that day as sacred, it is confusing to employ it as a designation of the first day of the week. But certain considerations destroy the force of this objection. First, the term "Sabbath" is not properly the name of a day at all, but of an institution. That institution may be appointed to be observed once a week, once a month, once a year, or once in seven years. Add to this the fact that this institution, occurring on the seventh day of the week, has been abolished, as Paul declares, (Col. 2:16), and then add the further fact that the Lord's Day lays claim to all the

religious observances that properly belong to the Sabbath; and the objection under consideration ceases to have any force. But the special point to which attention is directed, is the fact that, in numerous instances and in many of our state laws, the term "Sabbath" is actually employed. Since the term designates rest from labor, and since in usage it means rest from secular employments so as to afford opportunity for religious activities, our Sabbath laws very appropriately make use of it as a designation of the day of rest.

Another point to be considered in this connection, is the purpose for which Sabbath laws are enacted. This purpose is stated in a great variety of forms. Some of these are very significant. Sometimes it is declared that the first day of the week is set apart for public rest; sometimes it is said to be for rest and religious uses. The prohibitory clauses of these laws very frequently forbid whatever disturbs the peace and good order of society; and frequently they forbid all interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community. These and similar expressions indicate that the day of rest is not a mere holiday. In one or two instances, the term "holiday" is employed as a designation of the first day of the week, but, generally with singular uniformity, our Sabbath laws elevate this day to a higher level, and place it in a religious atmosphere and surround it with sacred associations. All this may be little more than a tradition of better times in the distant past, but it is noteworthy that our laws still retain something of the sacredness that attaches to divine institutions. If the body of Professing Christians would only harmonize their lives with these strong points in our Sabbath laws, there would be a great improvement in the matter of Sabbath observance.

Attention must now be given to the weak points in these laws. The first of these to be mentioned is the inadequacy, in many cases, of the prohibitory clauses. Sometimes the prohibition extends only to one's ordinary calling, apparently leaving him free to engage in some other calling equally secular. In some states, Arizona for example, scarcely anything in the line of worldly activities, whether labor, business, or amusements, is forbidden. This, however, is in harmony with the purpose of the law of that state, which makes the first day of the week a holiday.

A second element of weakness in these laws, is the numerous exceptions to the prohibitory provisions. This list has been growing from year to year, in many of our states, until almost everything that Sabbath breakers want to do is permitted. By way of illustration, let us take the law of Louisiana. The list of exceptions includes newsdealers, keepers of soda fountains, places of resort for recreation or health, watering places, public parks, the sale of ice, newspaper offices, printing offices, book stores, drug stores, apothecary shops, public and private markets, bakeries, dairies, livery stables, railroads—whether steam or horse, boarding houses, hotels, steamboats, warehouses for receiving and forwarding freight, restaurants, telegraph offices, theaters or any place of amusement.

Special attention should here be given the fact, that there is a strong and growing tendency to make an exception of certain forms of amusement. Athletic games are now legalized in a number of states, often, however, with the provision that they are to be held only in the afternoon between certain hours, and that no admission fee is to be charged. It is becoming more and more common to legalize motion picture shows on Sabbath afternoon.

In some states, various forms of worldly activities, including sports as well as business and labor, are re-

garded as legal—not because they are included in a list of exceptions, but because they are not specifically prohibited. In Pennsylvania, which is generally thought to have one of the best of all Sabbath laws, there is a general prohibition of "any worldly employment or business whatsoever;" but there is evidence at hand to show that a great deal of wholesale business is done on the first day of the week, and, with some dealers in real estate, this is considered the best of all days for the transaction of business. And if such things are done in this, one of the most Christian of all the states of the Union, what must be the situation in most of the others?

The insignificance of the penalty attached to our Sabbath laws, often tends to bring them into disrepute. In some states the usual penalty is only one dollar. In Pennsylvania it is four dollars in the most of the state, but was raised to twenty-five for Allegheny County, some years ago. In Kentucky the penalty is a fine of not less than two, nor more than fifty dollars. The law of Georgia, however, provides a penalty of not more than one thousand dollars, imprisonment not to exceed six months, or a sentence to work in the chain-gang on the public roads or on other public work. But such penalties are rare. They are usually so small that there is no end served by attempting to prosecute lawbreakers. There is no deterring power, in a penalty so light that it becomes a joke in the estimation of both lawbreakers and public officials sworn to enforce the law.

Special emphasis should here be placed upon the fact, that any and all Sabbath law will be weak, so long as the public conscience is not quickened. The Apostle Paul speaks of the failure of law "in that it is weak through the flesh." Herein lies one of the principal weaknesses of all our Sabbath laws. By "the flesh," Paul seems to have meant fallen, unsanctified human nature. It includes the carnal mind, which is enmity against God and is not subject to His law. This carnal mind makes the plausible plea against all Sabbath laws, that it cannot be wrong to do on the Sabbath what is right on other days. This sort of plea would allow no provision for either sacred seasons or sacred places. It would lead to the annulment of much of our ordinary legislation, since we have extensive codes of law, which forbid what is not in itself immoral. The law, itself, makes a distinction between what is immoral in itself, and what is immoral because it is prohibited.

The climax of weakness is not reached, however, until our Sabbath laws are regarded as based on human authority alone. The original idea, in both the British Islands and America, was that these laws rest upon divine authority. The Continental idea is that they rest upon no such authority, and this Continental view, and with it the Continental Sunday, have become quite prevalent in the United States.

This presentation of the strength and weakness of our Sabbath laws may prove beneficial, if it leads to right thought and action. It shows quite clearly, that people who claim the right not to keep the Sabbath religiously, have no ground for complaint. Their alleged right is most safely guarded. It is true that there are still some things which they cannot legally do on the Sabbath, but they are not things which they can claim the right to do in the name of religious or civil liberty. The fact is that those who do not choose to keep the Sabbath religiously, are more completely safeguarded in their alleged right, than are Sabbath keepers in theirs. This fact becomes apparent from the following considerations. In certain occupations, employees cannot observe the Sabbath with any degree of regularity

and hold their positions. Ministers of the gospel have testified that they are obliged to hold communion services on Sabbath night, after the day's work is done, so as to accommodate their members who are employed during the Sabbath day.

While the United States Government itself has no Sabbath law, in its various departments it has orders regulating the activities of its employees on the Sabbath, which have all the force of law. While post offices are not open to the public on the Sabbath, and mails are not delivered on that day, there is a vast amount of work done, and thousands of people are employed in handling and carrying the mails in post offices and on mail trains.

It seems that our civilization comes so far short of being Christian, that we actually need several thousand heathen to carry on our activities as they are now organized. What would happen if there should be such a revival of religion that the great body of those now engaged in Sunday labor should suddenly realize the greatness of the sin of Sabbath breaking? We would gladly welcome the "strike" that most certainly would follow.

But we are yet a long way from the full realization of the blessedness that attends general Sabbath observance. Doubtless the hard times which are now on us, and still harder times that seem to be pending, are due in no small measure to the sin of Sabbath breaking.

May we not fondly hope that Christian citizens in all parts of our country, as a result of this and similar discussions, will be led to study the Sabbath laws of each particular state in which they reside, discover their strength and weakness, and take steps to remedy their defects?

R. C. W.

THE BAR ASSOCIATION ON THE ALIEN

No charge of sensationalism can justly lie against the American Bar Association. It is composed of men who, by instinct and training, are careful and exact in their committments. And the American Bar Association says that the most serious phase in our citizenship is the foreign vote. The Association warns that the foreign born, or those of the first generation, now number more than forty per cent of our population; and that they are increasing far more rapidly in proportion than the old American stock. It gives further warning that the large immigration of recent years from Southern Europe, tends to become segregated in this country into foreign national groups which speak their former tongue, follow former foreign customs, read foreign language newspapers, and vote in blocs directed by padrones of foreign origin and purpose.

That combined warning comes from the American Bar Association. As such it will have to be accepted by even the most conservative. If it had appeared in a K K K circular, it would have been anathema.

THE CORRUPTION FUNDS

The sum of $9,700,000 was expended by the National Committee of the Republican party in 1920, and the sum of $3,225,000 by the Democratic National Committee. Here is subject matter for an editorial.

Sincerely yours,

F. E. Titus, Jackson, Michigan.

The political platforms and the leading statesmen of both parties have written their editorials so that all who read may learn, and the people are going to pass judgment on these editorials this fall.

Our friend is quite right. The lavish expenditure of money is subject matter

for continuous and independent editorial utterance before the people of the United States. No legitimate use could be made of any such amounts of money. The gathering of them was corrupt; the use of them was corrupting; and the demand for return favors was corruption unspeakable.

The franchise of a free people is a gift which God bestows upon men, in his building of the nation by inspiration through the fathers. That franchise is free, and it ought to be exercised freely.

The case is outside of possible argument. No such sum as $13,000,000 could be spent in honest and clean political appeal to the voters of this country. An acknowledgment of the expenditure is a confession of the guilt.

HENRY COLLIN MINTON, CHRISTIAN LEADER

One of the great men of the National Reform cause has passed from the earth. Rev. Henry Collin Minton, D.D., LL.D., for several years the president of The National Reform Association, died at San Rafael, California, in June 1924.

Dr. Minton was a notable preacher and scholar. His high abilities were recognized in the Presbyterian church by his election to the place of Moderator of the General Assembly in 1901. He had been chairman of the Committee on Creed Revision; lecturer in Princeton Theological Seminary and in Auburn Theological Seminary; and he had been an author of high repute. His chief works were "Christianity Supernatural" and "The Cosmos and the Logos."

As contributing editor to THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, he gave illumination to these pages by his wide knowledge and his graceful diction.

After years spent in the pastorate, and in the presidency of The National Reform Association, his health broke in 1916 and he removed to California. There he continued, in a quieter way, his labors and his studies, but he did not regain his vigor; and finally he passed peacefully away, firm in that glorious faith of which he had been such a shining exponent.

Dr. Minton was born at Prosperity, in the State of Pennsylvania, May 8, 1855. He leaves a widow, Mrs. Claire Smith Minton, and four children—two sons and two daughters, who, revering his memory, will transmit to posterity the knowledge of his great life.

In its session, June 16, 1924, the Board of Directors of The National Reform Association adopted unanimously the following resolutions:

Whereas, in the decree of Almighty God and in the order of nature, Henry Collin Minton, a man of great virtues and mighty faith, has been called from the scene of this world's activities to meet his eternal reward:

And whereas, the Rev. Henry Collin Minton was one of the most helpful and devoted members of The National Reform Association and through many years was its President; giving to his office the dignities and graces of a gentleman and a scholar, and to his labors a consecrated inspiration which won the love and confidence of all his co-workers and reached tens of thousands of the membership:

And whereas, bowing as we do to the immutable decree, we recognize that a mighty man in Israel has been taken away:

Now be it resolved by this Board of Directors that we express our gratitude to God and to the memory of Dr. Minton, for the long and splendid service which he rendered in general to humanity, and in a special way to this organization; that we express our reverence for his memory; and that we express to his widow and his children, our deepest sympathy in the loss which they have sustained.

Resolved that these resolutions be spread upon the Minutes of the meeting of this Board of Directors; that they be published in THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN; and that a copy be sent to Mrs. Minton and to each of the children of our departed friend.

The Passing of Bryan

By Thomas L. Comstock

William J. Bryan is always passing and has never passed.

Along with some millions of other people in this country, I read the papers, in early July, in which all the super-smart special political writers of the day told of the downfall of William J. Bryan as a leader of the Democracy.

And along with at least a moiety of these millions, I snickered—not at the cleverness of the super-smart special writers, but at their super-stupidity.

I have a scrap-book in which I keep track of some of the important figures in our political life. A very large section of it is devoted to the obituaries of this same William J. Bryan.

Let me touch upon a few of his many political demises.

He was dead as Julius Caesar after the campaign of 1896. He was buried under the "honest money" avalanche which descended upon his "fifty cent dollar." He could never be resurrected.

But he came back in 1900, the dominant figure of the Democracy.

In 1904 he lost another one of his political lives at St. Louis. Never more would his voice be potent in the councils of his party. Before the trap was sprung and before he was hung, he stood upon the platform, undismayed, although facing certain doom. Tammany and the machine had written the death warrant, and had delivered him over to the executioner. As for Poe's Raven, the only word for Bryan was "Nevermore."

But, in 1908, again he came back and was nominated for the Presidency. This third defeat settled him forever. Everybody said three times and out. "At last we are rid of Bryan forever." Most of the people who said this with any exultation were Republicans; and ninety per cent of the remainder were machine politicians of the Democratic party.

But, in 1912, back he came again, this time the controlling force at Baltimore; and it was William J. Bryan, who, more than all other individuals combined, nominated Woodrow Wilson and gave to the nation and to the world the greatest light that the Democratic party has ever shown—one of the mightiest figures of all time.

And now, according to these super-stupid special writers, Bryan is dead again.

Well, I will not believe it while he treads the earth.

What is the force of this man which enables him to survive such a series of political defeats as has never been suffered by any other one man in the history of the world?

It is the spiritual force! William J. Bryan is a man of God, a patriot—animated by super-human courage and sustained by divine power.

He has never been President and he never will be—in all probability. But he has written more progressive legislation into the history of the United States than any other man of his day.

Within the limits of this article, I have space for but one demonstration. The first issue upon which Mr. Bryan ran for the Presidency was bimetallism, so-called. In reality he was an advocate of the quantitative theory of money. Bimetallism was merely a step toward the increase of our money volume, to avoid panics and to avoid the locking up of money when money should be most needed. It had been the experience of the world that, in times of stress, gold sought a hiding place; and the more the world needed it, the less it was to be found. Hence panic. Experience has also demon-

strated that silver, being in larger volume, could not be so readily concealed, and thus was more available for use in time of urgent need. Bimetallism was just one factor in the quantitative theory, then fully proved by the social science of the world.

What became of the quantitative theory of money? It is fully established, and is fully vindicated in our present laws. The one thing that has saved this country from panic in recent years, has been the elastic money system, established under the Wilson administration, whereby the quantity of money can be enlarged according to the country's needs. If William J. Bryan had never done another worthwhile thing in all his political life, the nation would owe to him an undying debt of gratitude because he educated the people, and forced the politicians, to recognize the quantitative theory of money, and to embody these truths in our legislation for the protection of commerce and industry.

I could go on with many more things to the credit of this great and good man; but the purpose of this article was not to demonstrate Bryan's soundness as a leader, not to assert his wisdom nor his worth; but merely to show that the super-smart special political writers are merely super-stupid, when they write the political obituaries of William J. Bryan.

WE RECOMMEND "LIGHT ON MORMONISM"

That important magazine, *Light on Mormonism,* published by the Utah Gospel Mission at 9277 Amesbury Avenue, N. E., Cleveland, Ohio, carries in its June issue, several of the most illuminating articles which have found their way into print in recent years, concerning Mormon belief and Mormon practice.

There is an exhaustive presentation under the title, "Is Polygamy Still Practiced in Mormonism?" Every student of this dangerous cult ought to get *Light on Mormonism* in order to be informed. Several other articles of equal importance in their particular domain also appear in the June issue.

Individuals and societies, in the church evangelical, that are interested in this great question, cannot call themselves fully equipped unless they are subscribers to *Light on Mormonism.*

Dr. John D. Nutting, secretary of the Utah Gospel Mission is one of the best informed men in the world, on the teachings and practices of the church founded by Joseph Smith. Dr. Nutting has given nearly thirty years of unselfish and studious labor to the promulgation of the true Gospel among Mormons.

The magazine costs but twenty-five cents per year. Seven subscriptions to one address can be obtained for $1; and twenty-five or more subscriptions sent to one address can be obtained at fourteen cents each. Every missionary society and every church of the whole evangelical body ought to receive at least twenty-five copies of the magazine regularly.

MRS. SHEPARD AND THE MORMON MENACE

The many supporters of The National Reform Association, who have been privileged to hear Mrs. Lulu Loveland Shepard in her famous address, "The Menace of Mormonism," will be interested to know that Mrs. Shepard is still conducting her great work with the intelligence and zeal that have always characterized it. Mrs. Shepard is at present in the State of Maine, where she and her message have been received by large and enthusiastic audiences.

In some communities it is found that Mormon elders have been making converts from the membership of evangelical churches.

Thuggee Congress Strangling President

By Junius Channing Quincy

Once more the nation has been distressed by the spectacle of vital separations of opinions and purpose between the President and Congress.

Let us sincerely hope that this breach will be corrected by the general election of 1924, in the return of a President and a Congress which can be in harmony for the public welfare. President Coolidge has been dealing with a Congress as adverse to his policies as if it had been a Democratic Congress. Practically he has been in the same situation as was President Wilson during the closing two years of his second term.

We make no progress under such conditions. Indeed we are shamed as well as injured by the mad scramble of minor politicians to make advantage for themselves, no matter what may be the cost to the country in the mutilation or entire rejection of well proved policies put forward by the man who sits in the White House, and who is not only the President of the United States, but who should be accepted also, as his party's leader.

There is something absurd in the spectacle of a rejection of the presidential leadership by congressmen of his own party, who had formerly appealed to the voters to sustain the party, and to sustain the candidates because of their trustworthiness as party leaders. These congressmen ask, for their own advantage, that the party leadership be trusted by the people, but apparently they do not give their own trust.

When representatives and senators belonging to the President's party, which has a majority in the two Houses, set out to overthrow the President's policy; they place him in a worse position than he would be in if the Congress were controlled by the opposition party.

I recall that The Christian Statesman has called attention many times, to this great difficulty which exists in our country. It is intrinsic to our form of government. But its difficulty is seriously aggravated by the willfulness, the perversity, and, too often, the selfishness and the ignorance of men who have been sent to House and Senate.

We cannot make progress if the two branches of government are divided. That is true when the division is between the two parties. It is momentously true, and more seriously hurtful, when the division is between a Congress and a President both belonging to the same party.

One can hold to these views, without assuming that a senator or a representative in Congress becomes merely a register of the presidential will.

Certain policies are, assumedly, defined to the voters when they are asked to give their suffrage to the party and the party candidates. Certain leadership is selected by the convention of the organized party. And when the policy and the leadership are submitted to the entire electorate and a victory is accorded to the party, the policy and the leadership are accepted by congressmen and senators of that party, quite as much as these policies and these leaderships are imposed upon the whole country. What right has a congressman or a senator to reject the very thing which he has helped to fix upon the nation at large?

President Coolidge would have been able to build a substantial edifice of purpose and achievement in the nation, if his own party people had sup-

ported him. Instead of that he was confronted by a wrecking crew. They have been tearing down faster than he could build. There is no sense whatever in any such proceeding. The people get nothing in return for all their faith and confidence and for all the money which they expend.

Whether I belong to the President's party or not, I should prefer to see the Congress in harmony with his purpose—just as I wanted to see the Congress in harmony with the purposes of Woodrow Wilson.

In his attempt to build, the President has found his work torn down by members of his own party.

These are the people who are going out to ask in one breath that they be supported or returned to power, and that the President also shall be elected.

There is no merit in any such political piffle. And from what I can read of the expressed thoughtful opinion through the country, the majority of the electors within the Republican party are not disposed to give comfort to any such treachery to party and any such disloyalty to the best interests of progress in the nation and in our international movements.

Republicans at large have implicit confidence in Calvin Coolidge. They believe that he is conscientious, and safe, and statesmanlike. They want to have his policies supported if they shall elect him to the Presidency. They want progress along the lines which he has recommended. They want building and not wrecking. And therefore the majority of these Republicans are likely to give their favor to men who, in asking for the election of Calvin Coolidge and Charles G. Dawes as the accepted leaders, will give cordial support to presidential recommendations after they shall go to the House or Senate. The country is tired of having a little cabal of senators or representatives of the President's party, conspiring to destroy his leadership.

The perfidy of it all is apparent to average intelligence. These same senators and representatives, when they are out, are asking the people to support the party leadership as being something of superlative merit and trustworthiness. Why then are they not, themselves, bound to give the same recognition?

At this writing the Democratic Convention has not decided upon its platform or its candidates; but, unless it shall nominate Al Smith or someone equally ineligible, I should very much prefer to see its platform and its candidates win at the election, than to see Calvin Coolidge elected—and then defeated in his purposes, by the sending of some more Republican housewrecking crews to destroy his mighty work.

TESTIMONIAL TO WOMEN'S BOARD

The United Presbyterian church, in its sixty-sixth General Assembly, held in Reid Memorial Church, Richmond, Indiana, pays a highly deserved compliment to the women of the Missionary Society of that great denomination.

Two representatives of the Women's Board presented their work, Mrs. Ada Kerr Wilson of Pittsburgh and Mrs. W. P. Wiegering of Youngstown. The reports show that, during the year just closing, the women received through all their work in the church, the very large sum of $647,121.15. The thank offerings amounted to $160,565.91. The Board now supports 141 missionaries in the field. Thirteen new missionaries are scheduled to sail this Fall.

The following resolutions were adopted:

The General Assembly endorses and commends the splendid work done by the Women's Board.

The attention of all other Boards is called to the admirable policy of this Board, in keeping its liabilities and commitments within the range of its visible resources.

Reformed Presbyterian Synod

The ninety-fifth Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian church of North America met on June 5, 1924, at Winona Lake, Indiana. There was a large attendance and a most harmonious spirit. One of the men who has been attending Synod for the major part of half a century said at the conclusion, that there was a higher spiritual note in this assembly than he had ever found in any of its predecessors.

Rev. G. M. Robb of Bloomington, Indiana, was elected moderator for the ensuing year. The sermon of the retiring moderator, Rev. E. A. Crooks of New Castle, Pa., was a powerful presentation of the duty of Covenanters to fulfill the Ministry of Reconciliation. The closing part of that sermon so closely relates itself to National Reform that it is here given:

III. The Place of God's People in His Plan of Reconciliation

God operates through His people in carrying out His plans among men. In the work of reconciliation God has bestowed distinguishing honor on His people. He has appointed them, all of them, ministers of reconciliation. He has commissioned them to carry the message of restoration to men everywhere. They are to broadcast the good news that God has provided, through Jesus Christ, for the return of the world to Himself. Every reconciled individual is to be a transmitting instrument of the wonderful message. "Let him that heareth say, come." Paul's example is worthy of our imitation. He proclaimed the message to the Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Barbarians, slaves and free; the women at the riverside prayer meeting; the keeper of the jail; his fellow passengers on the wrecked ship; the philosophers at Athens; and to governors and judges and kings. He won converts in Nero's household. Ministers, elders, deacons, Sabbath school officers and teachers; members of missionary and young people's societies; missionaries at home and in far off lands; members of the church, one and all, we are commissioned to carry the good news of reconciliation to our fellow human beings.

Our field is long and broad. It stretches across a continent and touches its limits north and south. It extends to the Near East and the Far East. It includes the Negro, the Indian, the Hebrew, the Syrian and the Chinaman, in addition to our neighbors on every side. We are commissioned the messengers of reconciliation to all these. We are to minister to them as their needs demand, of the by-products of the gospel in healing and education and in dustrial leadership. Here is an ample field for every one of us, in personal service and sacrificial giving, to magnify the ministry of reconciliation.

The name "ambassador" is more than a hint at another part of the work of reconciling the world to God. An ambassador is an accredited representative, sent by his sovereign or his government to a foreign court. He is the personal representative of his country. Jehovah, the Sovereign of the universe, sends His personal representative to the nations of Earth. Joseph was an envoy extraordinary, sent to Egypt to make provision for a great providential emergency that was to arise in the world of that day. Moses was a plenipotentiary to Pharoah. Isaiah and his fellow prophets were ambassadors to Israel and Judah. Jonah was an envoy to Nineveh. Daniel was accredited by the court of Heaven, to the court at Babylon. When Paul reasoned in Agrippa's court, he appeared as the ambassador of King Jesus. When Martin Luther met the summons of the august assembly at Worms, he appeared as an envoy of the Kingdom of Heaven. When sturdy Andrew Melville plucked the sleeve of that stubborn Stuart, James VI, calling him God's silly vassal, and reminding him that there were two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland, he was speaking as the ambassador of King Jesus.

On a number of occasions, dating from the days of the immortal Lincoln, members of our communion, usually joining hands with other Christians of like convictions, have appeared before the President of the United States and the Judiciary Committee of Congress, presenting the

claims of Jesus Christ on the nation. Many times our ministers have appeared before state legislatures and constitutional conventions, pressing the claims of Jesus Christ. When the convention was in session that framed the constitution of our little sister republic, Cuba, that great constitutional lawyer and versatile linguist, Dr. David McAllister, addressed the convention in the native tongue of its people, urging on them the claims of Jesus Christ the King of nations. One of our missionaries reached the ears of the President of China, through his secretary, with this great message. Another of our ministers was at Paris, seeking opportunity to urge on the assembly representatives of nations, the necessity of recognizing the Prince of Peace, as the Guarantor of peace to a bleeding nation.

From hundreds of thousands of pulpits and platforms, the message has been proclaimed. Literature, millions on millions of pages, has been sent forth, explaining and urging the claims of Jesus Christ as King of nations. While we gladly recognize the large part that other Christians have had in this great propaganda, it is only stating the truth to say that the impetus has come largely from the Church that is bound, by solemn covenant, to maintain these principles.

ABOUT PRESIDENT EDGAR

The United Presbyterian for June 26, 1924 has a very interesting article on Thomas Delbert Edgar, D.D., who is president of The National Reform Association.

The first paragraph of the article will be especially interesting to the readers of THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, who know of the very large activities of Dr. Edgar's life, and the high station which he holds among Christian leaders, but who do not know, personally, Dr. Edgar or his antecedents:

Thomas D. Edgar is a native of Illinois, having begun life at Coulterville, Randolph county. He is the second of seven sons born to the late Robert Sinclair Edgar, M.D., and Sarah Jane Alexander, who still survives. His ancestors can be traced to Scotland and the north of Ireland, but for several generations they have been in America. Both families from which he sprang, first landed in South Carolina. The Edgars were early settlers in southern Illinois, having come to that region while Illinois was still a territory. Mr. Edgar's mother was born near Knoxville, Tennessee, but came with her father's family to Bloomington, Indiana, in her girlhood days. Both of these families were of Covenanter stock.

LOOKING TOWARD THE KINGDOM

The one hundred and eighteenth regular session of the Synod of the Reformed Church in America was opened June 5, 1924, in the Grand Avenue Reformed Church of Asbury Park, New Jersey.

The acting president, the Rev. Henry Evertson Cobb, D.D., delivered a sermon from which we select the following significant paragraph:

That is the burning question before the Church today, "When will the Kingdom come?" There is no organization but the Church that can answer that question—no other that definitely purposes to answer it. Is there any reason why the Kingdom should not come soon? If we will give substance to the things we hope for—if, like Joseph, every Christian may be brought to a consciousness of the divine purpose in his life—if, with Abraham, we can understand that God has called us to build the city of God—if, like Moses, we are willing to fight alone and unceasingly, and to suffer loss for Christ—the Kingdom of God will swiftly come. When men see the reality of that Kingdom, the kings of the earth will bring their glory and honor into it; the young men and women of this land will get the vision of what Christ and His Gospel mean for the world, and they will yield their splendid strength to the King whose right it is to reign.

Rev. John E. Kuizenga, D.D., of the Western Seminary, was elected president on the first ballot.

The sessions of the Synod were characterized by prompt and encouraging business presentation and by an inspiring harmony.

An Attitude for Christians

The *Pacific Christian Advocate* has resurrected a paper which was read in February, 1914, before the Home Missions Council at Salt Lake City Utah, by Bishop Franklin S. Spalding of the Protestant Episcopal Church. That paper was entitled, "A Proper Attitude toward the Mormon Church and People."

The Utah Gospel Mission's magazine, *Light on Mormonism,* pays significant attention to this reproduction; and it offers most serious and effective argument against the assumption by the *Advocate* that "the point of view taken and the conclusions expressed in Bishop Spalding's document are emphatically worthy of respect."

Because of the wide interest which is manifested in the subject, and in order that the whole matter may be placed before interested readers, it is well that the case should be carefully stated.

More than ten years ago, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN printed, in full, Bishop Spalding's noted dissertation, and made a sufficient rejoinder. The purpose of giving Bishop Spalding's entire text was in order to insure for him a fair hearing, inasmuch as the answer was to be specific and pointed. Bishop Spalding had taken a few sentences from some documents issued by The National Reform Association, and had built his whole argument thereupon,—without giving the context of the sentences.

In making its rejoinder through its official organ, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, The National Reform Association preferred the fair way of dealing in argument, and it gave full presentation of the other side as well as its own.

At this late date, the matter has been exhumed by the *Pacific Christian Advocate,* with presentation only of Bishop Spalding's views. The National Reform Association's rejoinder is out of print. In answer to many of the requests for complete enlightenment upon this controversy with the Mormon hierarchy, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN herewith reprints the whole matter.

AN ATTITUDE FOR CHRISTIANS

The Social Service Commission of the Episcopal Church in Utah publishes a magazine called *The Utah Survey.* In its issue for February, 1914, it carries a paper written by the Right Reverend Franklin S. Spalding, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of Utah, on "The Proper Attitude toward the Mormon Church and People."

Outside its own intrinsic merits, Bishop Spalding's paper derives importance from these facts:

1. It was read before a conference of the Home Missions Council, which was held in Salt Lake City, February 9th and 10th. As "representatives of a number of the national boards of Protestant churches" were there to "inform themselves about Utah's religious problems," it is probable that the document will be widely considered.

II. Every line in the paper will be hungrily scanned by the skilled controversialists among the Mormon priests. If anywhere it betrays a weakening of Christian militancy, they will use such weakening to promote their own aggressive propaganda. If anywhere it concedes a recognition of Mormonism as a Christian faith, they will exultantly use recognition as proof, that their century long struggle to sanctify their false prophet Smith in the eyes of the world, has come to its predicted fruition.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN reprints the paper in full. It is commended to the careful scrutiny of Christian patriots.

"The Proper Attitude" is devised for the Christian world. If it is right, our crusade against the Mormon Kingdom is wrong. If our crusade is right, "The Attitude" is wrong.

We state the case thus bluntly in advance, and we give a full hearing to "The Attitude," because we hold Christian truth dearer than any "attitude" of diplomacy, and more precious than any "crusade" of unrighteous zeal.

We have read, and read the second and third times, the scheme of "The Proper Attitude," and we are forced to confess that the more we study it, the more indefinite seem to be its methods, the more demoralizing its omissions, and the more inconsequential its results. If the "attitude" is "proper" for all Christian workers, one is led to the inquiries: Why any distinctive attitude toward the Mormon church? Why interfere in any way with its orderly progress? Why not adopt as a rule the Bishop's sentence: "One almost wonders whether controversy has any value whatever?"

But we will reserve analysis and comment, and here let the paper speak for itself, asking our readers to understand now and through all their consideration of this matter, that this is no personal controversy with Bishop Spalding nor with any method of Christian advance. Bishop Spalding's right to make his own attitude and to recommend an attitude to others, is clearly beyond gainsaying. But, as a corollary, the right of other Christians to study, to question and to oppose his promulgation of "The Attitude for Evangelical Workers" cannot be abridged.

THE PROPER ATTITUDE TOWARD THE MORMON CHURCH AND PEOPLE

A *Paper Read before the Home Missions Council.

On Sunday, January 25, 1914, I heard Elder Orson Whitney, an Apostle and Historian of the Mormon church, deliver a sermon to two thousand people gathered in the Provo Tabernacle for the Conference of the Utah Stake. Elder Whitney asserted as follows:

Priesthood is only another name for truth, and the authoritative priesthood of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is faultless and flawless. That this priesthood might be given to men, the whole history of the human race had been divinely planned. If God has, at times, used others than Latter-day Saints in the progress of human society, they were used as instruments to prepare the way for the final culmination, His revelation of Himself and His plan of salvation through the mission of the last and greatest of His prophets, Jesus Christ alone excepted, Joseph Smith.

For example: Columbus was not a Mormon but a Gentile, and yet he discovered that the planet was a sphere and that on its opposite side was a new continent. He was permitted to make this discovery in order that upon this new continent, Joseph Smith might reveal the Gospel. God had raised up patriots like Washington and Franklin, but His chief purpose in inspiring them was that they might found a nation in which Joseph Smith, Jr., by a fuller endowment of divine power, would, "in this last and grandest dispensation in the meridian of time," restore to men the valid priesthood.. Wordsworth sang of the pre-existence of the soul. God inspired him with a faint idea of the doctrine so that men's minds might, in degree, be prepared for the full unfolding of that truth by His greater prophet Joseph Smith. Indeed, God has revealed Himself in other dispensations of time through prophets like Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and Moses, but the only function of these worthies was that of being forerunners of Joseph Smith who, in the fullness of times, restored and revealed to men the final, complete, unchangeable Priesthood of the Church of the Living God.

This Church includes everything that is true, pure and good. If, perchance, some truth should be discovered outside this Church, God has used the discoverer as an instrument only because, as yet, His Latter-day Saints are too few in number to render to Him every service; but His real intent was that the truth should be appropriated by the Saints as theirs by right. Outside the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints there is no complete truth, no unsullied purity, no absolute good. It was devised before all time in the Eternal Council of the Gods and, fulfilling all prophecy and completing all types, in the fullness of time it was set up among the children of men by the last and greatest of the prophets, Joseph Smith, no greater prophet, seer and revelator than whom can ever arise.

I do not believe it is possible to understand Mormonism without considering these remarkable claims. They are taught the children and they are reiterated at every address. The proposition reduces itself to this. If a thing is true, it is Mormonism; because Mormonism includes all truth. To be outside of Mormonism, is to be outside the divinely appointed means of spiritual

*Bishop Spalding's Paper in the Utah Survey, Vol. 1, No. 6. Salt Lake City, Utah, February, 1914.

ife here and hereafter. The faithful, orhodox Mormon is perfectly logical when ie looks upon religious teachers of the arious churches, much as a Roman Cathlic looks down upon Protestants. When a Iormon boy is made deacon, he is given share in this marvelously perfect priestiood. He receives a fuller endowment of ruth and authority as he is promoted to he higher offices of teacher, priest, bishop, lder, seventy, evangelist, prophet, apostle. o be cut off from the church is not herely to change ecclesiastical membership, ut it is to be driven from the Father's able and forced to feed on the husks. ince a man can confess that Joseph mith is a prophet of God, only by the Ioly Ghost, failure to bear such witness is in against the Holy Ghost—murder is the nly sin more deadly than apostasy.

This is the only form of Christianity aught to the young Mormons, and they re taught it just as we were taught by ur parents the Christianity we believe. It s not proved—it is asserted. As soon as he boys and girls can remember anything, ney remember their parents and their near elations—those in whom they have greatst confidence—giving their testimony to ie Mormon form of church organization nd theological expression, and to Joseph mith, Jr. as a prophet of God. Just as oon as they are old enough, they are enouraged to bear their witness to the same lleged divine facts. They do not think, they re not expected to think. They receive the estimony of others and, having by this ct of faith accepted the "Gospel," they roceed to strengthen their faith by giving heir testimony, by bearing their own witess to its truth. The Mormons have eveloped a system of training in giving estimony. If, at first, the child cannot ive testimony to the divine mission of oseph Smith, he is required to testify o the goodness of his parents, his teacher, o God's love; and so is led on gradually to ear his testimony to the greatest of the rophets. The result is a blind, unreasoned elief in the founder of Mormonism as a rophet of God, and in the truth of very claim he made, every word he spoke, very rite he ordained. The young Morons are taught to pray for the authorities f the church, and to believe that their rayers are answered. Therefore to deny he inspiration of their leaders, is to oubt that God answers prayers. Havng made this surrender and having been ubjected to this discipline, their loyalty s unfaltering.

Now the first point I want to make is that a very large percentage of the members of all Christian churches accept the creed and discipline of their several denominations, and strengthen their faith and loyalty, by precisely this same psychological process. The laymen in our Protestant and Catholic churches are too busy, to study history and philosophy and theology. Nine-tenths of them know no more than they did when they went to Sunday School, and a large number of those who remain loyal, do it by a will to believe, not by a will to think. In these days, when clergymen have so many practical duties, they have little time to continue the studies they began in perhaps the most unscientific institutions of learning we have, our theological seminaries. They, too, hold to their denominational creed and organization, in the same unthinking way that the Mormon holds to his. If faith seems to be wavering, the usual advice is not to think harder, but to pray harder, to do more work for the Church—in a word, to use the same means used by the Mormons.

Of course we all protest that our faith and our Church organization rest on more solid foundations than that of the Mormons. This may be quite true, and yet I may wonder how a Presbyterian can look back with satisfaction to John Calvin, or how a Baptist can make such a fuss over the quantity of water used in baptism; while both Presbyterian and Baptist may wonder how a man in his senses can care for apostolic succession. We may think that its historic basis in the alleged supernatural experiences of Joseph Smith, Jr., is untrue, we may feel that Mormonism is an irreverent and carnal combination of religion, business and politics; but such an estimate does not help to an understanding of the way the Latter-day Saint looks at the matter. Surely it must be admitted that it is all-important to get a man's point of view, before one can hope to influence him; and the Christian missionary has not always in the past tried to get the Mormon's point of view.

1. The likeness I have to insist on between Mormon belief and loyalty and the belief and loyalty of other religionists, shows the difficulty of the problem. It is just as hard to induce a Mormon to change his faith, as it is to induce a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian or a Roman Catholic to change his—and for exactly the same reason. One almost wonders whether controversy has any value whatever.

In Bergson's address as president of the Society for Psychical Research, he disapproved of all controversy. Here are his words:

> I think the time given to refutation in philosophy is generally lost. Of all attacks directed against each other by so many thinkers, what remains? Nothing or very little. What does count, what does remain is the contribution made to positive truth; the true affirmation takes of itself the place of the false idea and becomes without any argument or controversy, the best of refutation.

I confess this is too much of a counsel of perfection for me. I cannot help feeling that I must point out to the Mormon what I feel are the untruths he believes, as well as proclaim in his hearing, as convincingly as I can, the positive truth I hold. The theologian is a kind of philosopher who cannot avoid a sense of duty to proselytize. Yet surely it is clear, that sarcasm and ridicule are not only discourteous but stupid forms of argument. That follows, the moment we understand that the Mormon believes in Mormonism, be it true or false, by exactly the same mental process by which we believe our faith.

We know that the sneer of the blatant infidel, instead of shaking our loyalty, intensifies it; and in like manner the universal flood of derision which has been poured out upon Mormonism, has only made Mormons more loyal. They feel about books like Lamb's "Golden Bible" and the various tracts published and circulated by Mr. Nutting of the Utah Gospel Mission, exactly as an orthodox Christian feels about Tom Paine's "Age of Reason" or Ingersoll's "Mistakes of Moses." The more simple, devout and unquestioning the faith is, the more keenly the injustice and irreverence are felt. It is for this reason that most of the anti-Mormon literature which has been published has had as little effect in changing Mormon belief, as Protestant books telling of the horrors of the inquisition or the occasional immoralities of the confessional, have had upon devout Roman Catholics.

It must be confessed with shame, that courteous controversy has been very rare. Last year I published a small pamphlet, in which the competency of Joseph Smith, Jr., as a translator of an Egyptian text, was discussed in a courteous and judicial manner. This pamphlet was chiefly remarkable because it was the only criticism of Mormonism anybody remembered, which was written in such a spirit. So universally have other methods been used, that it wasn't to be wondered at that some Mormons felt that my profession of an honest desire to be fair, was ironical. The publication was almost unique in one other respect. It was written for Mormons. Most of the literature produced by Gentile missionaries has been intended chiefly for foreign consumption. I sent complimentary copies to all the higher officials in the church, to all the professors in Utah colleges and to the teachers in church and state high schools. The manager of the Deseret Book Store asked for copies and sold nearly two hundred, which was a larger number than was sold in the Gentile store where the pamphlet was also placed on sale.

The reception of that pamphlet has, to my mind, been encouraging; although many Gentile friends have insisted that this very reception is evidence of the futility of that type of criticism. Over forty replies have been printed in Mormon publications. This is at least proof that my argument was read.

The answers seem to me to dodge the real issue or to confuse the question, and yet I am forced to admit that the method used by Latter-day Saints in repelling my criticism of the supernormal wisdom of Joseph Smith, Jr., is the same method used by nine-tenths of the defenders of other religions. The same kind of special pleading and suppression of unwelcome facts has been used repeatedly by believers in verbal inspiration, in reply to the arguments of higher critics; by Roman Catholics in defending the Infallibility of the Pope; by most religionists in maintaining the transcendent importance of their own special theological emphasis. Theological beliefs, once they are embodied into creedal statements and accepted by groups of men, change very slowly. Enough time must elapse to enable the new truth to work its way into the minds of all who hold the old truth. Nobody accepts any truth until he thinks he thought of it himself. Infinite patience, unfailing courtesy, frank sympathy, consummate tact, are needed in our controversy with the Mormons; and they have all been conspicuously absent in the past.

II. In the second place, we must try to put favorable constructions upon Mormon words and acts. There is a great temptation to search for the weaknesses, and to overlook and even hide the values. Every man working in Utah knows the pressure of the Eastern demand for lurid tales about the Mormons. Those of us who must raise money to carry on our work, are

tempted to make collections of stories of exceptional and rare polygamous conditions, ignorant speeches by uneducated elders, tales of the conditions in Utah years ago, and to make use of this material in our addresses as a means of increasing interest, arousing sympathy and raising money. Last spring the editorial writer in the *Deseret Evening News*, the official Mormon paper, made this statement about me:

> The concluding act of all of Dr. Spalding's Eastern addresses, namely, an appeal for funds wherewith to "fight the Mormon monster" fully explains the cause of his activity. It is the meat in the cocoanut of every attack on the "Mormons." And thus once again it is illustrated that money is the root of all evil, even of falsehood in the pulpit.

I did not think this charge was just, because I have tried hard to be fair; but it cannot be denied that there is a strong temptation to do that to which the editor justly objects.

On the other hand, the Mormons habitually overpraise their own virtues and idealize their history, so that one is tempted to offset their exaggerations with charges of disloyalty and immorality, which are not true today and which violate the rule of Christian charity which bids us cover a multitude of sins. The following is an illustration of the way we put an unfavorable construction upon the words of the Mormon leaders. At a recent Conference of the Pioneer Stake, according to the report in the *Deseret News* for January 26, 1914, Elder Rulon S. Wells urged the duty of honest tithe paying as following:

> The world does not understand the principle of tithing, it can never be successfully introduced in the Christian denominations because there is no priesthood, no authority, no one authorized to collect and handle the tithes of the people. The payment of tithing is an index to the faith of a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. If a young man desires to be married in the temple, if he goes to his bishop and asks for a recommend to the house of the Lord, the bishop may know by his tithing record, whether or not he is worthy to go through the temple. It is like feeling the pulse of a person who is ill, it is an outward sign of his spiritual condition; and, as the beat of the pulse indicates the physical condition of a person, so does the tithing record indicate whether or not the true spirit of the gospel and true faith characterize his spiritual condition.

Now, a good many Gentiles have quoted those words, as proof of the low, unspiritual, commercial spirit of the Mormons; and I confess that when I read the speech I felt that this financial test of spirituality was sordid, and that I might well use it in future addresses, as an illustration of Mormon depravity. But as I thought the matter over, I was forced to admit that I myself had said the same thing a great many times. I have told congregations of Christian people, that a religion they were too stingy to pay for could do them no good, that the offerings of the members of the Church were a test of the reality and the spirituality of their faith and love, that Church debts were evidence of spiritual deadness.

Many Gentiles criticise the Mormon tithing system, because the revenue is spent by the head officials without consulting the wishes of the people who contribute the money. This seems un-American. But I am deterred from joining in the condemnation, by remembering that that method is exactly what my own Board of Missions is constantly trying to have the Church adopt. It is argued that the Board officials know the needs better than individuals can, and that missionary gifts will not be wisely spent, until special giving to favorite objects and workers is stopped and all gifts are sent to the Central Board to be disbursed by its experts. The only difference between my point of view and Elder Wells's is, that I do not think the Mormon church uses the tithes for legitimate purposes; but that, of course, opens up quite a different question.

So vitriolous has the attack on Mormonism been and so much interest has been aroused throughout the whole country, that every missionary from Utah is expected to present new evidence of polygamy, treason, and even white slavery. There are societies and individual lecturers busy supplying this demand. The National Reform Association, of which James S. Martin, D.D., is general superintendent, with offices in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, held a reception to Ex-Senator Frank J. Cannon, in Philadelphia, on February 5th of this year. The invitation sent to leading citizens read as follows:

> Open defiance of law, the teaching of treason, the multiplying of polygamous marriages, the most aggressive proselyting now progressing in the world—these compel attention to the Mormon church and organized action against it.

A careful man, cognizant of the facts, would have to qualify every one of those statements. The people in Utah are law-abiding, the charge of treason depends on a part of the Temple ritual which may be as much a dead letter as parts of the

Anglican Liturgy. The old Temple oath to revenge the death of the prophet is undoubtedly repeated by the majority of Mormons, with a mental reservation. Not only are polygamous marriages not multiplying, but polygamy was never practiced by the Mormons to the extent popularly supposed; and if the churches are even half awake, they have nothing to fear from the proselyting efforts of two thousand Mormons scattered over the earth, most of whom are school boys, who know only a few little speeches and a few Bible texts, and who look at the call to a mission quite as much as a chance to see the world, as to convert it.

The point I want to insist on most strongly, is that we must be on our guard lest we yield to the temptation actually to regret that the Mormons are improving—to be almost sorry that we have lost our old thunder, because we can no longer honestly repeat the stories of the sensationalists who are not held back by either truth or charity. It is high time that the same hopeful attitude was taken with reference to Mormonism, as has been taken in regard to other religions which we as Christians consider inadequate. The thoughtful student of the great ethnic religions today, tries to find points of contact and glimmerings of truth. The days in which interest in foreign missions was aroused by dreadful tales of brutality, lust and ignorance, have happily passed away, and the spiritual and ethical value in even the religions of the backward races, is being recognized. The attitude toward the Mormon seems to be the sole exception to this more philosophical method of approach. We will surely be wiser and more Christian, if we think that because the Latter-day Saints have so much truth they deserve more truth; than to persuade ourselves that they have willfully rejected all truth, and are steeped in lust and crime and therefore utterly bad.

III. That thought introduces my next suggestion. It is our duty frankly and gratefully to acknowledge advance whenever we can. I am convinced from a good deal of investigation and observation that polygamy is no longer an issue in Utah. After the manifesto was published suspending the practice of polygamy, and after Utah became a state, there were unquestionably a number of young Mormons who entered into polygamy. In a spirit of fanaticism they proposed to practice their religion. Over two hundred names of new polygamists have been published, and Mr. Roberts told me that he thought there were ten times as many whose names had not been published. But that wave of folly has spent itself, and the forces of civilization and religion have gained strength. The young Mormon does not want to practice polygamy. He may say that he believes in it as a doctrine, but he doesn't want to practice it himself. In the very nature of the case, it is impossible to perpetuate polygamy in the twentieth century, in the U. S. A., in the temperate zone. It is not fair to expect young Mormons to condemn polygamy, because in so doing they would condemn their own fathers and mothers.

You ask why they do not strike out the polygamy section from the "Doctrine and Covenants." The answer is: For exactly the same reason that we can't get the 39 Articles out of the Prayer Book. Ecclesiastical societies are always most conservative. It is harder to change church law, church ritual, church organization, than any other social conventions. The dead letter must be very dead before it is buried. There are still hyper-Calvinists among the Presbyterians, in spite of the revision of the Westminster Confession, but if an ardent Methodist believer in free will spent time and money discovering as many as he could, and then published the list and insisted that the revision of the Westminster Confession was a piece of hypocrisy, and that the Presbyterian church really believed all that Jonathan Edwards preached at Stockbridge—his procedure would not be commended as loving and Christian. And yet must it not be admitted that this is just about what has been done in the case of the Mormons and polygamy?

There are also other proofs of Mormon improvement. In Utah the Bible is displacing the "Book of Mormon." Where one hears one proof text from the "Book of Mormon," he hears the Bible quoted a hundred times.

The idea of God is being spiritualized. In proof of this, may I offer two quotations? On June 16th, 1844, Joseph Smith preached from the text: *"And hath made us kings and priests unto God and His father: to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1:6.* In that sermon he said:

> In the very beginning, the Bible shows there is plurality of gods—beyond the power of refutation. The word "Elohim" ought to be in the plural all the way through—gods. The head of the gods appointed our God for us; and when you take this view of the subject it sets one free to see all the beauty, holiness and perfection of all the gods.

Now compare that with this quotation from an article in the *Deseret News* of January 31, 1914, which was secured for the paper by Apostle Talmage, the official theologian of the church:

> As known in history, religion manifests itself in two forms, which have been nearly equally prominent: (1) the normal or vital; (2) the conventional. The first form is characterized by a desire for direct relationship between the human soul and the Ultimate Source of life and power, to the end that, normally, the ultimate may be embodied vitally and effectively to all humanity. In the second form, the human mind, because of disability or partial instruction, stops short in its "passion for God," and is satisfied, or seeks so to be, with clever formulae and conventional rules for living and thinking—ending by accepting words for ideas, and the forms of habit and custom for life-expressions.

The Mormon church is interested in education. The desire of a young man to study in an eastern university excuses him from going on a mission. This year $316,450 has been appropriated from general church funds for church schools in Utah. It is true that in these schools youths are taught the Mormon faith, but evidence is not wanting that the system of education is being steadily broadened. The present Superintendent of Church Schools is Mr. Horace H. Cummings. He is considered by many of the younger Mormons too narrow and orthodox, and strong opposition is being developed to his being continued in office.

While it is true that many Mormons who are graduated from eastern universities remain faithful, and even devote their talents to defending their church doctrine and practice, a much larger number, even though they remain in the church, take broader, truer views of religion, and let their light shine. We may wish that they would break with the Mormon church and become members of our denominations. Some of them do, and we welcome and respect them; but I think we ought to have quite as much respect for the larger number who deliberately remain in the Mormon church, feeling that they can be more helpful from within than they possibly could be from without. One of the ablest teachers in Utah told me that the president of the eastern university from which he was graduated with honors, advised him to remain in the Mormon church as long as they would let him stay. He told him that was the bravest way to play the game. I venture to urge that in public discussion of Mormonism we should consider how our words will help these Mormon reformers, far more than how our words rebuke and scornfully denounce those who still endeavor to perpetuate old beliefs and practices.

In conclusion, may I urge upon the Home Boards of our various churches two considerations which I believe follow from what I have tried to say?

I. You must not expect immediate results in Utah. Our problem is to convert Mormonism, rather than to convert individual Mormons. Statistics of increased church membership are no test of the value of the work done and the money spent. Local self-support cannot be expected for a long time. The reaction from tithe paying, results in a lack of generosity on the part of those Mormons who become members of our churches; and of course those whom we hope we reach indirectly, cannot be expected to contribute.

And yet, since the Mormon church is financially able to expend vast sums of money on schools, hospitals and meeting houses, you must use money to make the equipment for *our* church work dignified and attractive. Appearances count for a great deal in the West, and small, shabby churches make a poor impression. And we must have the best men you can find. The Mormons we want to help today are not the ignorant, religious fanatics of the last generation, but are young men and women who have been educated in eastern and western universities and who are tempted to repudiate organized religion altogether, or to sell their souls for the temporal advantages the Mormon church offers. These men are the intellectual superiors of some of the missionaries our Boards have thought strong enough for work in Utah.

II. In the second place, you must clearly understand that it is absolutely impossible for the same man to work in Utah, and also to raise money in the East by talking about it. The same man cannot satisfy the eastern appetite for Mormon information, and be helpful to the Mormons. In the East, he is expected to expose the worst in the Mormons; in Utah, his usefulness depends upon his trying to see the best. Even though he tries hard to be fair in his presentation of his case, distorted reports are sent home and his influence is weakened. Besides, all the time he has is needed for his work in Utah. If the churches could put fifty first-rate men in Utah and keep them there for ten years, I believe they would have a wonderful influence.

For one other reason, the Utah mission-

ary—indeed any western missionary—should not be asked to solicit funds in the East. The whole spirit of the West despises the man who goes East to knock—not to "boost." The accounts the pleader for money is expected to give, of the spiritual destitution and moral depravity of the grandest and most promising part of the United States, can by no stretch of the imagination be called "boosting." It does not increase his own optimism, and it decreases the respect and confidence of his fellow citizens.

F. S. Spalding.

Mormonism is founded upon the claim that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was lost to the world, through nearly 1800 years, until it was restored by Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet.

Is that claim true?

The *Proper Attitude* of the whole Christian world toward the Mormon church, must be determined by the answer to this question, and by nothing else. The Attitude must be absolute. There is no compromise. The Mormon church will permit none. Christians cannot make one, without denying the efficacy of Christ's divine mission to the world.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN will not waste words over this matter. No Christian can hold controversy with himself, nor with any other Christian, upon this point.

The Gospel was once and for all delivered to the saints. It was *never* lost. Christ's mission did *not* fail for 1800 years. It has not failed for one instant. He needs no restorer. We need no mediator between us and Him.

Mormonism is, therefore, an insolent blasphemy.

And the Proper Attitude of Christianity toward Mormonism is determined by the facts: that Proper Attitude is uncompromising opposition.

* * * * * *

It is inevitable that Mormonism shall make the will of its prophet the law of its being. As the true Christian looks to the Gospel for his guide, as the good citizen heeds the laws of his country, the Mormon church takes the word of its prophet of today, above all other words. He is the Living Oracle. "He is the mouthpiece of God." To him must be given unquestioning obedience, as to God.

Mormonism claims the right for its prophet, as priest and king, to bear rule in the civil affairs of state and nation.

Is that claim true?

The Attitude of American citizens toward the Mormon Kingdom must be determined by the answer to that question, and by nothing else. And, again, the Attitude must be absolute. Again, there can be no compromise. The Mormon Kingdom permits none. American citizens will make none.

Once more, there must be no waste of words, where there can be no controversy.

This nation is supreme, under God, in civil affairs. There can be no division of authority. The Mormon Kingdom must not be permitted to rule the nation: and, if not the nation, it must not be permitted to rule any group of states, nor any state, nor any part of any state.

The Mormon Kingdom's pretension is, therefore, an insolent treason.

And the Proper Attitude of American citizens toward Mormonism is one of uncompromising opposition.

* * * * * *

But the Attitude will be expressed in the varied terms of our varied humanity.

And here is the opportunity for the application of Christian zeal and mercy, patriotic determination and fairness.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN believes that a quick settlement of the Mormon problem is a merciful settlement. Palliations and postponements only involve innocency in the consequences of guilt. For that reason, we invoke Christian zeal and patriotic determination. We believe that the Mormon church has been encouraged in its impossible pretensions, its unbearable practices, by every apology, every defense, every commendation, every countenance, every delay, every evasion that has come

rom kindly but unsagacious Christians. Ve are well aware of Mormon heroism. t is not in controversy. We know of Iormon industry and thrift. They re not in dispute. Other people than Iormons possess these qualities. But ie Mormon church is the only in-itution in our country, which is al-)wed to plead virtues as a license for ins. The Mormon church, alone, is per-iitted to offer the thrift of its people, s a cover for the greed of its priests; ie devotion of its members, as a shield or the disloyalty of its creed; the eauty of its Temple or the music of its rgan, as a defense or a denial of the olygamy practiced by its prophet and ing.

We maintain that the only way Christianity can make advance is to bandon all policy of false excusings, ain flatteries given and received, half ecognitions and half denials of Mor-ionism as a Christian faith.

We maintain that the only way this ation can resume its rightful sover-ignty over the Mormon Kingdom, is) hold the Mormon priests within ie rules of civil authority that are oluntarily observed and faithfully uarded by Christian churchmen.

Anything less than these absolutes giving away Christian ground in re-gion, and national sovereignty in overnment.

And, if they are to be retained, they ust be constantly and aggressively as-rted within Mormondom, and against Iormonism, as long as the cause of onflict endures.

* * * * * *

Usually there has been a school of entleness and generosity toward Mor-ionism.

Sometimes that school has been ani-ated by the wonder "whether contro-ersy has any value whatever" against rror. But we have no such wonder. he controversy against untruth is the ivine order for struggling, aspiring ankind. The human race makes no her progress. It never will advance this mortality by any other road.

Sometimes that school has been moved by a desire to convert Mormons away from Mormonism, by a complaisant or apologetic attitude toward its errors. We are not nearly so much concerned with the weaning of the Mormon away from his church, as we are concerned with inroads made by Mormonism into the homes and the government of this Christian nation. Let the results of the two efforts justify our concern. Where the complaisant attitude of Christian missionaries is taking one Mormon out of his creed, and into another and a nobler faith, the militant propaganda of Mormonism attracts scores of converts from evangelical churches. Where one disloyalty of the Mormon priesthood is checked, innumerable other intrigues are encouraged and carried forward. And it is no answer to say that Truth has nothing to fear from Error. The mission of Truth is not fulfilled by its forbearance in the presence of aggressive error. In the long warfare, Truth triumphs; but its victories in this world are won by assertiveness, militant assertiveness.

And sometimes that school is fixed in a determination to demand from Mormonism a due deference to statutory and Christian institutions. This seems to us the highest type of gentleness and generosity. Any other "attitude toward the Mormon church and people" is but an inducement for their bigotry to sweep on until they are met in harsher conflict. Their own history is proof. We are not speaking for persecution nor unjust proscription, but for a rigorous insistence that Mormonism shall not be flattered by Christians, into further impracticable and pernicious ambitions.

* * * * * *

"Open defiance of law, the teaching of treason, the multiplying of polygamous marriages, the most aggressive proselyting now progressing in the world—these compel attention to the Mormon church and organized action against it."

The foregoing went out under the authority of our National Reform Association. Bishop Spalding's paper

says of it: "A careful man, cognizant of the facts, would have to qualify every one of these statements."

Here is presented an issue of veracity. Let us call official records and "The Proper Attitude" as witnesses.

"Open defiance of law" is the first point involved. The prophet of Mormonism lives openly with five wives. So the prophet himself affirmed on the witness stand. How far then does "a careful man . . . have to qualify" the words "open defiance of law"? The National Reform Association had in its view, not only the fact of Prophet Smith's flagrant lawbreaking, but these further facts, which add emphasis rather than justify qualification: the prophet of Mormonism claims a divine authority, as an embodied example to his church and his people. His defiance of law, his violation of his pledge to the United States, are known to non-Mormon citizens of Salt Lake. And yet he stands the chief figure, the undisputed ruler, in the finance, the politics, the social life, the ecclesiasticism of his community. To THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN it appears that there is an "open defiance of law" by the prophet of Mormonism; and, what is more dangerous, a most un-Christian acquiescence by professed Christian workers.

"The teaching of treason" is the second point. Upon this, Bishop Spalding's paper is such an illuminating witness that we shall call no other. It says: "The old Temple oath to revenge the death of the prophet is undoubtedly repeated by the majority of the Mormons, with a mental reservation." It appears, then, that the oath is taught. How far does "a careful man . . . have to qualify" the words "the teaching of treason?" Certainly it is no modification of the charge, to say that the majority of the Mormons are hypocrites. To show a combination of treason-teaching priests with followers who falsely subscribe to the oath in the Temple, is to make our charge even more significant.

"The multiplying of polygamous marriages" is the third point. Again Bishop Spalding's paper is the witness. It says: "Over two hundred names of new polygamists have been published, and Mr. Roberts [Referring probably to the high priest and polygamist, Brigham H. Roberts, who was refused a seat in Congress. (*Managing Editor* THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN.)] told me that he thought there were ten times as many whose names had not been published." How far does "a careful man . . . have to qualify" the words "the multiplying of polygamous marriages?"

But the Bishop qualifies even the expert, Mr. Roberts, by saying: "That wave of folly has spent itself. * * * It is impossible to perpetuate polygamy in the twentieth century, in the U. S. A., in the temperate zone." Why is it impossible? Polygamy was *established* in the nineteenth century, in the U. S. A., in the temperate zone. It was established by men from the New England states, of Puritan stock; its women were of that same race. Practically the only admixture, during the first fifty years of Mormonism, came from the people of Northern Europe. Later, polygamy has received accessions from softer races. How are we to know that the "wave of folly has spent itself;" and that another wave is not coming in, and still another? Careful men are sometimes guided by the light of experience.

The Mormon church professed a complete abandonment of polygamy and polygamous living, in 1890. The present prophet of Mormonism swore to that before the Federal master in chancery, in April 1891, in a hearing for the restoration of Mormon church property. Under that pledge, accepted by this country, the Mormon church and its hierarchs received such bounteous gifts as were never before showered upon reconstructed rebels. If the Mormon church ever renewed or permitted the practice of polygamy after that convenant in 1890, its perfidy and ingratitude are without parallel. It has placed itself where a

majority of careful men will not care to offer excuse in its behalf.

What is the fact?

The *Salt Lake Tribune*, in 1910, *twenty years after that pledge was given*, published "over two hundred names of new polygamists," and Mr. Roberts told Bishop Spalding he thought there were "ten times as many whose names had not been published." Not one of them was punished by the civil law. Bishop Spalding attributes this horrifying renewal to "a spirit of fanaticism."

Certainly, but there is something more. *Mormon fanaticism has encountered Christian toleration.* And both have been promoted by a new and dangerous movement arising outside, but making its confidential expression inside, the Mormon Kingdom. Among the "advanced thinkers, physiologists, eugenists," who are looking for an improvement in the race, several have come to a tentative acceptance of polygamous doctrine. These have been giving encouragement to Mormonism. One expert in eugenics spent some years in the study of polygamous families in Utah. All through Mormon circles it is whispered that this expert's conclusion is an approval of polygamy, and that "at last the revelation of God is proved by the learning of men and women."

Neither polygamous practice nor polygamous teaching has ever been suppressed in the Mormon church. Repressed it has been at times; and the degree of repression has been in close relation to the degree of militant pressure from the outside. Even at this hour, regardless of the confidence of good men like Bishop Spalding—and even because of such confidence, another secret "wave of folly" may be sweeping through Mormondom, only to be known of by non-Mormons after it has "spent" itself.

Why not? What possible assurance is there to the contrary? In 1896, the country at large was as confident as Bishop Spalding is now. There were Christian teachers in Utah, among them a mighty bishop of his own church, who were themselves assured, and who were assuring us, that polygamy was dead. These "careful men" qualified every statement made by accusers of the Mormon church. They were as sincere as Bishop Spalding. They were measurably intelligent. They had fought Mormonism through long and valiant years. When they consented to peace, they staked everything upon the integrity of the Mormon church promise. They felt that they must "help those Mormon reformers;" they must not "rebuke and scornfully denounce those who were still endeavoring to perpetuate old beliefs and practices:" they, too, devised what they believed was "The Proper Attitude." And they were betrayed. Their very faith in the present Mormon prophet was made a sneer by him.

More is needed now than words by Mormon priests, more than the trust of Christian missionaries in Mormon promises. More is required than an "attitude" of conciliation. There is nothing in Bishop Spalding's dictum that is more conclusive than was the pronouncement of Christian men in Utah, in 1896-1902. If any difference, his is the less convincing. In 1896, we had some reason to believe in the truthfulness of Mormon church promise; now we have none. In 1896, the Mormon church would stand practically alone in its polygamy; now there is a cult of sympathizers among the restless un-Christian "newthinkers." Then the Mormon church had no large wealth and political power, to protect its offenses; now it has both. The array of evidences and arguments might be extended indefinitely; but at this point, taking the course into such careful consideration as we can give, THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN feels justified in declining to "qualify" the statement, "the multiplying of polygamous marriages."

"The most aggressive proselyting now progressing in the world" is the next point involved. We take Bishop

Spalding's letter once more as the witness. He speaks of the Mormon missionary system as, "two thousand Mormons scattered over the face of the earth, most of whom are schoolboys." Is there any other such aggressive proselyting as this? What other church can send out every two years, and scatter over the face of the earth, two thousand school-boys to preach with ardor, even if ignorance, and without one dollar of cost to the church? We are not talking of quality, but of aggressiveness.

The Mormon church is not seeking to convert brains; it wants brawn. It has enough intelligence at the top, for its purpose. It is seeking recruits who will work and obey. For making an appeal to such classes as Mormonism can usually reach, school-boys are peculiarly fitted. Their youth attracts sympathy. Their apparent ingenuousness disarms opposition. Even their ignorance is valuable; it lulls some Christian teachers into security. They go from door to door insisting upon a hearing. If the front door is closed to them, they ask for permission to talk at the back door. They bombard the newspapers with letters. They cry that they are persecuted. They assume a right to invade any presence with their message. If a Christian missionary in Utah were to take such liberties at Mormon doors, or at Mormon church steps, or on Mormon temple grounds, as Mormon missionaries take everywhere they go, he would be called back by his church, after having been arrested for the disturbance of other people's peace.

Here is a characteristic instance of Mormon aggressiveness: At Grand Rapids, the mayor refused to grant a permit for Mormon missionaries to preach in the streets. A state senator went from Utah, armed with a letter from the governor and with prospective orders for furniture. He brought political and commercial demand for the permit. He indicated that compliance meant continued orders upon the Grand Rapids factories; refusal meant a complete withdrawal from Grand Rapids by the largest furniture dealers in the inter-mountain country. The permit is still refused. But what Christian church shows such aggressive proselyting? The Mormon missionary travels without purse or scrip, living off the "wicked world" as far as it will consent. What aggression like unto this by any other missionary movement?

"These compel attention to the Mormon church and organized action against it," is the final statement that Bishop Spalding would qualify. But The National Reform Association still feels that attention and organized action are essential. The Mormon church must be required to fulfill the promises which it made to the Government and the people of the United States. Until that shall be done, we propose to wage a Christian and lawful crusade against its offenses. This is a Christian republic. It cannot longer endure the polygamous monarchy within its states. To contemplate such a thing as a permanency, is impossible; to delay the settlement by one unnecessary hour, is as cruel to the Mormon commonalty as it is injurious to the national self respect.

* * * * * *

Bishop Spalding's paper says:

> You ask why they do not strike out the polygamy section from the "Doctrine and Covenants." The answer is: For exactly the same reason that we can't get the 39 Articles out of the Prayer Book.

A careful man must qualify that statement. To get the 39 Articles out of the Prayer Book would require council and agreement. But the polygamy section could be struck from the "Doctrine and Covenants" at the mere order of one individual, the prophet of Mormonism. The prophet has left out many revelations, after they had been printed as the will of God to the world. He has done this at his own whim. He has convened no council, has asked no authorization. The present "Doctrine and Covenants" carries what the prophet wants it to carry, and nothing else.

To show his complete power and his cunning use of it:

The anti-polygamy manifesto, issued by the Mormon church in 1890, started with all the dignity of an assumed revelation from God. Frail as were its terms, it was interpreted to the nation as a divine command. It was the president prophet who told the Federal Government, on his oath, what the Lord meant by the manifesto. And no President, no Congress, no court, presumed to ask the Almighty to be more precise in His language.

As the years went on, the manifesto receded from its place as a command. It was not printed in any book of doctrine of the church. Its very language was forgotten. And all this recession was calculated. Every "schoolboy" preacher of Mormonism, without any personal knowledge of its terms, could testify of that manifesto, and induce credulous people to believe that polygamy had been authoritatively forbidden. And every "fanatic" priest could ignore the manifesto. That opportunity to play double was also calculated. Here was the most important document ever issued by the Mormon church. It was the return from exile; it was citizenship; it was pardon; it was the key that unlocked prison doors; it was restoration of community wealth; it was statehood; it was passport to the world's respect; it was promise to men; it was dignity to women; it was convenant with God; it was pledge to the Mormon generations yet unborn. And for twenty years it could not be found in any book of Mormon church laws or rules! Under public challenge, the prophet finally tossed the manifesto into the "Doctrine and Covenants." But he printed it after the "covenants and commandments," and even after the appendix. It stands there in helplessness. It is titled "Official Declaration." It is signed by a president of the church, who died seventeen years ago. The doctrine of polygamy is *a revelation from God.* The denial of polygamy is *a declaration of man.* And the prophet emphasizes this sufficient contrast by the manner of printing the two, so that no priest shall mistake what is *doctrine* and what is *"an extorted promise."* The "Compendium" of Mormon doctrine (1912) teaches polygamy, and makes no reference whatever to the anti-polygamy manifesto. The annals of intrigue may be searched in vain for a more calculated and brazen trick. Not even Bishop Spalding's generous answer abates one jot or tittle of that record of broken faith.

* * * * * *

Bishop Spalding's paper says that the Mormon idea of God is being spiritualized. A careful man, cognizant of the facts, would have to qualify that statement.

On December 16, 1913, at a Conference of the Mormon stakes of Zion in Arizona, held at Phoenix, Joseph F. Smith, the Living Oracle for Mormonism, made an address in which he said:

I know that God is a being with body, parts and passions, and that His Son is in His own likeness, and that man is created in the image of God. The Son, Jesus Christ, grew and developed into manhood the same as you and I, as likewise did God His father, grow and develop to the supreme being He now is. Man was born of woman; Christ, the Saviour, was born of woman; and God, the Father, was born of woman. Adam, our earthly parent, was born of woman into the world, the same as Jesus and you and I.

That is as material and gross an idea of God as ever came from Brigham Young or Joseph, the first Mormon prophet. So there has not been any spiritualizing.

It is rather startling to read the money plan part of Bishop Spalding's paper under the title "The Proper Attitude."

In the second place, you must clearly understand, that it is absolutely impossible for the same man to work in Utah, and to raise money in the East by talking about it. The same man cannot satisfy the Eastern appetite for Mormon information, and be helpful to the Mormons.

Eastern readers and Mormon readers of the Bishop's paper are not likely to

feel complimented. They may be mutually resentful of the unmistakable implication.

* * * * * *

Our problem is to convert Mormonism rather than to convert individual Mormons.

This is stated as Bishop Spalding's plan of campaign. But convert Mormonism into what? Into Christianity? Into Truth? Very good. And it will be Mormonism no longer. It will have to abandon its claim of mediation between this world and the Divine Redeemer. It will have to abandon "the greatest of God's prophets, Joseph Smith." It will have to abandon his successors. It will have to abandon the vain "Book of Mormon," and the fraudulent "Book of Abraham," and the ignorant and supercilious "Revelations" It will have to abandon its temporal rule, its profane commercialism in the name of God's kingdom, its political intrigues, its priestly plots to rule state and nation. Its ecclesiasts will have to abandon polygamy, polygamous cohabitation, and the spiritual sealings to other men's wives. Its Trustee-in-Trust will have to abandon the millions which have been tithed from its people, and the other millions which have been restored by the Government. It will have to abandon the temporal power which enables it to "tempt" its "educated young men and women to sell their souls for the temporal advantages the Mormon church offers." Its whole nature must be changed from a kingdom to a church, from a superstition to a faith, from an irresponsible theocracy to a responsible democracy.

We will not disparage the beautiful confidence, the Christian zeal, which hopes and labors to "convert Mormonism." This sublimity may be attained in the centuries. And always the consecration to such a task is a splendor.

But in the meantime, what? Shall the Mormon Kingdom, with its polygamous sultan, its stolen amnesties, its fraudulent millions, its political plots, its broken promises, be immune from external correction? Shall law be suspended, and constitution abrogated, and morals waived, while the years for the "conversion of Mormonism" are running into generations?

* * * * * *

Without a thought of interference with the holy mission which Bishop Spalding has defined for himself and for such as are willing to adopt his "attitude," THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN and The National Reform Association see, for themselves, another duty. Under the inspiration of God, and with His blessing upon the endeavor, that duty may be a devoted one and it may be a fruitful one.

Humbly before Him, we set our hands to the work.

It is, to wage a lawful Christian Crusade against crime veiled as a religion; against disloyalty masquerading as pious ritual; against a system which receives the price and breaks the promise; against financial fraud perpetrated in the name of the Almighty; against a political machine which calls itself a church; against the Mohammedan harem in this Christian land; against a kingdom set up in this Republic.

The Proper Attitude for us, and for any who believe as we do, is to make no terms of delay or paltering with the Mormon church. Its day of negotiation closed twenty-four years ago. This is a time, and none too early, for fulfillment. It has been aggrandized until, as Bishop Spalding says, its own educated young men and women are tempted to "sell their souls for the temporal advantages which the Mormon church offers." It has been pampered by politicians, and courted by financiers, and flattered by educators and encouraged by eugenists, and condoned by preachers, and coddled by the world generally; until it feels that it has a vested right in crime and treason; until it assumes the domination of states; until it hopes to control the Government. The time to end all this miserable mistake is now. For the sake of the historic Mormon heroism the time is now. For the sake of a yet possible future for Mormon integrity and loyalty, the time is now. For the sake of the nation, and its need

internal peace and union, the time is
)w. For the sake of other than Mor-
on homes, the time is now. For the
ke of God and His Son, the time is
)w.

We are not so troubled about Mor-
on faith. We are troubled about
ormon practice. To "convert Mor-
onism" may be a possibility. To cor-
ct Mormonism is a necessity.

The "conversion of Mormonism" is
the mists of futurity. By the time
is achieved, the young Mormons for
hom the glorious labor is to be per-
rmed, may have "sold their souls."
he correction of the wrongful prac-
ces of Mormonism is of all things
finite and immediate.

That correction requires only that
e Mormon church and its priests
all be made to keep the pledge they
ve to the United States. The pressure
law, the pressure of publicity, the
essure of national opinion may well
concentrated upon that correction.

The National Reform Association has
nsecrated its energies to the cause.
nd it has adopted the following as
e program which it will respectful-
urge upon the Government and the
ople of the United States:

I. A constitutional amendment to
rbid polygamy and polygamous living.

II. A proceeding by the Department
Justice to force an accounting of
e property which was restored to the
ormon church in trust; and a pro-
eding to dissolve the Mormon church
operty trusteeship, as a combination
restraint of trade.

III. An order by the Post Office
epartment, withholding the privileges
the mails from the Mormon church
d its responsible officials, so long as
ey teach the crime of polygamy.

IV. A refusal by each House of
ngress, to seat any man who pays
litical allegiance to the Mormon
urch, or is elected by its power.

V. A refusal by the President, to
point to any Federal office, any man
o pays political allegiance to the
rmon church.

VI. Political opposition by all Chris-
n patriots, to any candidate who is
known to be an ally of the Mormon church in politics, or who will not pledge himself to this program.

And this correction must be continuously applied, until the Mormon church fulfills its covenant with the country; and until the Mormon church repairs, so far as possible, the evil which its promise-breaking has wrought.

Specifically:

1. The Mormon church should cease the teaching of polygamy. It should exclude the pretended revelation and all claim for polygamy, from its books of doctrine.

2. The church should compel every polygamist, under pain of excommunication, to cease his unlawful relations, and to make a just provision for his wives and children.

3. All the polygamous marriages solemnized, and all the polygamous children born, since the last date of legitimization, should be publicly registered by the church, and it should assume a definite responsibility for the future of the women and their offspring.

4. The church should withdraw from commerce. It should take its poor from the public almshouses and make them the beneficiaries of the properties which they created and which the Government restored.

5. The church should cease to inculcate disloyalty and vengeance; cease its usurpation of civil powers; keep its ruling hierarchs from civil office; and set its people free in politics.

In this crusade for these holy ends, there is no attack on religion. No person will suffer a wrong.

All that is good in Mormon community life will be preserved. The industry, the thrift, the fraternity—all the admirable things will be as forceful then as now.

We condemn the assumption, which Mormon priests promote and shallow observers adopt, that a Crusade against *crime* must attack industry, or thrift, or happiness, or contentment, or piety or any form of virtue. The most hurtful enemy to the Mormons, is he who assumes, that the perpetuation of their

SAFETY BONDS

WHERE are your funds now invested?

WHAT interest are they now bringing you?

WHEN you are through what will become of your funds?

For SAFETY and a SURE LIFE INCOME
write for Booklet 3 even if not interested at the present time.

We hope that *now* you can send a donation to help give the Bible to the immigrants, the sailors, the sick in hospitals, the prisoners, and in raised type to the blind.

"The Bible in New York," a pithy quarterly publication, will be mailed *free* to all interested in Bible distribution.

New York Bible Society
5 East 48th Street, New York
The oldest Bible Society in New York

good qualities and deeds is dependent upon the perpetuation of the offenses of their prophet; that their industry is the creature of his greed; that their freedom subsists in his tyranny; that their virtues can be maintained only by his polygamy; and that their religion dissolves when he obeys the law.

* * * * * *

Christian missionaries may find it easier to "convert Mormonism," after the correction of Mormonism; easier to convert the educated, law-abiding and loyal Mormon after the correction of the fanatical, law-breaking and treasonable Mormon. It is even possible that after the correction, there will be less need for conversion.

For our part, we would have the "Mormon Church and People" righteously enjoy their freedom of faith in this republic. Living the covenant to which they pledged their honor, no Christian hand will be raised against them. Freed from the offenses and the burden of the offenders, that have roused the just indignation of their betrayed country, they will develop the best that is within their human mass. If their system can survive the eradication of its priestly crimes and criminals, it will take its place among the conventional faiths of mankind. But it will have ceased to be the Mormonism which now invades the rights, and affronts the civilization of this Christian land.

There are many sects. There is but one Christ. In His Great Day, the differences may fall away from faiths. And all who will to share in His salvation, may unite as brothers in His worship.

There are many powers in our nation. There is but one sovereignty. As long as our citizenry must express their will through government and must hold their rights under its rule, there can be no invasion of its supremacy. Any further attempt to substitute Mormonism for our Christian government we must resist. Against any present substitution we must wage a crusade.

We owe that duty to ourselves. We owe it to Christ, the Ruler of all.

AT THE BIG DESK

RATES—Payable in advance, $2.00 the year. In Canada and other countries, $2.25. Single copies 20 cents. Club rates on application.

REMITTANCES—Should be made by check, draft or money order payable to THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, and mailed to Room 501, Publication Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. Receipt will be sent if two-cent stamp is enclosed with remittance.

EXPIRATIONS—The time of expiration is given each month on the wrapper. Special notice will be sent in advance. Please notify us soon after receipt of last copy if you wish discontinuance.

RENEWALS—Please specify "renewal" and write name as it appears on the label. If payment is not received in due time we shall not feel warranted in continuing. Please be prompt.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Change of address or notice for discontinuance should reach us by the first of the month. Do not fail to give both old and new address. Acknowledgment will be made by change of address on the wrapper.

Special Terms to Canvassers

Special Club Offers

Write Us NOW

To our Winona Lake and Stony Brook Friends:

For this year at least, we have decided to expend our energy and money in other and more insistent lines of Association work than "Get-Togethers," enjoyable and profitable as these have been. They are also expensive to the organization. There are other phases that need emphasis. Information you have come to know, must be carried with awakening power to millions throughout the nation, through publicity.

Will you help us in this work? We know you will.

If you went to these or other assemblies solely for good citizenship reasons, estimate how much of the Lord's money you used in travelling and hotel expense, and then spend this amount as Home Missionary money in sending THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN to friends, at home and elsewhere, who you believe would be interested in the type of patriotism and good citizenship represented by this Christian and patriotic journal. Do you realize that there are thousands of Christians just as sincere as we, who have not yet had the civic Gospel preached to them? "How shall they hear?"

We are also asking that those who made pledges at last year's Assemblies, see that their pledges are renewed for the coming year. Will you do this?

We wish we might lay before you the hosts of letters that are pouring into our office, praying that the way may be opened whereby a nationwide campaign can be put on to bring this magazine to the careful consideration of every Christian patriot of America.

Pray On!--But Also, Labor On!

The Education Number

September

All old readers of **THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN** will look forward to the September number with more than usual interest. Every year we have **hundreds of special requests** from those interested in religious and public education, some of whom are not regular subscribers, but become such.

Those who have not yet subscribed will find this a most opportune time to do so.

THE SEPTEMBER ISSUE IN PACKETS OF TEN

In past years, many of our subscribers have asked for extra quantities of the September issue. Sometimes they have applied after the issue was exhausted. To provide against disappointment, we are asking that you send in your orders **in advance.** To encourage this we are offering to send this special issue, in packages of ten, for $1.00—one-half our single copy rate—to those who will distribute judiciously and who will do follow-up work.

The Remainder of the Year for 50 Cents

Until August 31, we will enter subscriptions, to include our **SEPTEMBER EDUCATION NUMBER,** October, November and December **(one extra number)** for 50 cents.

SEND IN YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS AND RENEWALS BEFORE GOING ON YOUR VACATION

Printed at The Crescent Press, Pittsburgh, Pa.